

NOV 24 1947

VOLUME XLII

NUMBER 4

October 1947

---

---

# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

---

---

*A Quarterly Journal* devoted to re-  
search in the Languages, Literatures,  
History, and Life of Classical Antiquity

PERIODICAL ROOM  
GENERAL LIBRARY  
UNIV. OF MICH.

*sent*

---

---

THE UNIVERSITY of CHICAGO PRESS  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

## EDITORS

JAKOB A. O. LARSEN, *Managing Editor*  
JOHN PHILIP COOKE, *Assistant Editor*

CHARLES HENRY BEESON  
BLANCHE BEATRICE BOYER  
RICHARD TREAT BRÜERE

CARL DARLING BUCK  
PHILLIP HOWARD DE LACY  
BENEDICT EINARSON  
FRANKLIN P. JOHNSON

RICHARD P. McKEON  
RALPH MARCUS  
GERTRUDE SMITH

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

HAROLD F. CHERNISS, *University of California*  
KURT VON FRITZ, *Columbia University*  
GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON, *Yale University*

Dom ANSELM STRITTMATTER, *St. Anselm's Priory*  
LILY ROSS TAYLOR, *Bryn Mawr College*  
JOSHUA WHATMOUGH, *Harvard University*

VOL. XLII

CONTENTS FOR OCTOBER 1947

No. 4

Insular Contribution to Medieval Literary Tradition on the Continent	Blanche B. Boyer	209
'Ἀπόλλων Ὀρος	Alexander H. Krappe	223
Julian Dates and Greek Calendars	W. Kendrick Pritchett	235
Breaks in Conversation and the Text of Petronius	Eli E. Burris	244
Notes and Discussions		249
ARTHUR E. GORDON: Further Light on the "Mystery" Inscription in California.—EVA MATTHEWS SANFORD: Honorius and the Wheel of Fortune.—ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE: Mythology and Mycology.		
Book Reviews		254
PIERRE COURCELLE: <i>Les Lettres grecques en Occident: De Macrobe à Cassiodore</i> (Laistner).—LESLIE WEBBER JONES (trans.): <i>An Introduction to Divine and Human Readings by Cassiodorus Senator</i> (Laistner).—A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE: <i>The Theatre of Dionysus in Athens</i> (Allen).—J. H. THIEL: <i>Studies on the History of Roman Sea-Power in Republican Times</i> (Starr).—ERNST LEVY: <i>Pauli Sententiae: A Palingenesia of the Opening Titles as a Specimen of Research in West Roman Vulgar Law</i> (Schiller).—FRANK CARD BOURNE: <i>The Public Works of the Julio-Claudians and Flavians</i> (Van Sickle).—MODESTUS VAN STRAATEN: <i>Panëtius: Sa vie, ses écrits et sa doctrine avec une édition des fragments</i> (De Lacy).— <i>The Journal of Juristic Papyrology</i> , Vol. 1, No. 1 (Boak).—[GEORGE] HOYNINGEN-HUENE and DAVID M. ROBINSON: <i>Baalbek [and] Palmyra</i> (Debevoise).		
Books Received		265
Index to Volume XLII		267

Classical Philology is published quarterly in the months of January, April, July, and October, by the University of Chicago at the University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. ¶The subscription price is \$5.00 per year; the price of single copies is \$1.50. Orders for service of less than a full year will be charged at the single-copy rate. ¶Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States and its possessions, Argentina, Bolivia, Brasil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Republic of Honduras, Mexico, Morocco (Spanish Zone), Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Rio de Oro, El Salvador, Spain (including Balearic Islands, Canary Islands, and the Spanish Offices in Northern Africa; Andorra), Spanish Guinea, Uruguay, and Venezuela. ¶Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada and Newfoundland, 16 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$5.16), on single copies, 4 cents (total \$1.54); for all other countries in the Postal Union 40 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$5.40), on single copies, 10 cents (total \$1.60). ¶Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to the University of Chicago Press in United States currency or its equivalent by postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following are authorized agents:

For the British Empire, except North America, India, and Australasia: CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Bentley House, 200 Euston Road, London, N.W. 1, England. Prices of yearly subscriptions and of single copies may be had on application.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 37, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor of Classical Philology, Box M, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill. All manuscripts must be typed, double spaced—both texts and notes—with ample margins on firm paper (not onion-skin, etc.).

The articles in this journal are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York, N.Y.

Applications for permission to quote from this journal should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, and will be freely granted.

Entered as second-class matter June 20, 1906, at the post-office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in United States Postal Act of October 3, 1917, Section 1103, amended February 28, 1925, authorized June 6, 1918.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

7  
.

ry

4

9

3

5

4

9

4

5

7

f

;

e

o

y

e

e

y

a

-

x

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

;

●  
P

7

b  
is  
w  
tr  
te  
In  
th  
th  
(4  
C

gs  
19  
In  
Zi  
In  
to  
on  
be  
th  
lis

Sir  
Yo  
lea

die  
LI  
TA  
G.  
(18  
[Cl



# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Volume XLII

OCTOBER 1947

Number 4

## INSULAR CONTRIBUTION TO MEDIEVAL LITERARY TRADITION ON THE CONTINENT

BLANCHE B. BOYER

THE activity of Irish and Anglo-Saxon scribes in the Middle Ages is known to have been prodigious, both at home and abroad. Evidence of this is found in (1) the extant manuscripts written by Insular copyists; (2) Insular traits, both scribal and editorial, seen in texts copied on the Continent by non-Insular hands; (3) the dissemination of the works of Anglo-Saxon and Irish authors throughout the medieval world; and (4) the acquaintance in the Islands with Continental authors.

The first of these is a subject of investigation in which I have been engaged since 1927.<sup>1</sup> The earliest published estimate of Insular manuscripts was that of Heinrich Zimmer, whose chief interest was in the Irish manuscripts dating from the seventh to the eleventh century still in existence on the Continent. He reckoned the number as at least 200, including 33 written in the Irish language exclusively.<sup>2</sup> The only list of Insular manuscripts was published

by Walther Schultze.<sup>3</sup> He, too, was interested mainly in the Irish manuscripts preserved on the Continent; he listed 117 (= 142 items) found in libraries exclusive of the Vatican and the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. This number he estimated to be approximately three-fourths of the total. Actually, the 117 included 13 which he specified as Insular only in decorative motifs, initials, glosses, or similar in script. He queried 3 others, which are, in fact, not Insular. Thus his score was, rather, 101, which drops further to 92, for in his Irish category, numbering 65, there were included 8 non-Insular, 18 Anglo-Saxon, and 2 of mixed character; in his Anglo-Saxon list of 35 were counted 2 Irish, 1 Anglo-Saxon in decoration only, and 1 not now extant; to these he added 1 which might be either.

My research has brought to light 550 Latin manuscripts of the eighth to tenth centuries, of which 400 are wholly Insular, the other 150 divide into three classes, of approximately 50 each, Insular in part and in decreasing degree, on the basis of (1) mixture; (2) corrections, glosses, and marginal notes; and (3) influence in writ-

<sup>1</sup> Generously assisted by grants from the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation of New York (1929-31) and from the American Council of Learned Societies (1933).

<sup>2</sup> "Über die Bedeutung des Irischen Elements für die mittelalterliche Cultur," *Preussische Jahrbücher*, LIX (1887), 57 (translated by Jane Loring Edmonds, *The Irish Element in Mediaeval Culture* [New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons; London: Knickerbocker Press, (1891), p. 124].

<sup>3</sup> "Die Bedeutung der irischschottischen Mönche für die Erhaltung und Fortpflanzung der mittelalterlichen Wissenschaft. III. Irische Handschriften auf dem Continent," *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, VI (1889), 287-98.

ing practices. On the Continent there are preserved more than twice as many Anglo-Saxon and Irish manuscripts as in the British Isles, nearly six times as many fragments, eleven times as many in mixed scripts, fifteen times as many with Insular corrections, etc., and five and one-half times as many written under Insular influence. Even for authors of the Islands the scriptoria of the mainland became the literary executors and (sometimes, sole) trustees of their *monumentum aere perennius*. And to Continental authors the same service was rendered by the Insular scribes abroad.

One of the earliest Latin texts of Irish authorship is an anonymous tract, *De duodecim abusivis saeculi*.<sup>4</sup> The *terminus ante quem* is set by a long quotation from it (*abusio nona*) in the *Collectio canonum Hibernensis* (ca. 725), where it is attributed to St. Patrick—as also in a letter of Cathuulfus, an Anglo-Saxon, to Charlemagne (ca. 775),<sup>5</sup> a short citation of the same. The *terminus a quo* is probably the date of Isidore's *Etymologies* (ca. 630). This, or a source adopted by Isidore, is one of three works used by the author; the other two are the Vulgate Bible and the *Regula Benedicti*.

The tract was known and used in Ireland by the eighth-century compiler of the *Collectaneum Bedae*, who inserted excerpts from it in his curious *mélange*, but without specifying his source. It was excerpted by Sedulius Scottus for his *Liber de rectoribus Christianis* (post 840) and *Collectaneum*; and in the latter the assignment is to Augustine. Hellmann suggests: "Nicht unmöglich, dass die Iren, um jenen Traktat auf den Festland leichter einzubürgern, ihn statt mit dem Namen des Patri-

cus, mit dem bekannteren und besser klingenden Augustins versehen, und dass dementsprechende Änderungen auch in K [= Sedulius] vorgenommen wurden."<sup>6</sup> In the catalogue of the library of St. Riquier (831) it is listed as Augustine's; also in those of Würzburg, *saec.* IX, and Lorsch, *saec.* X.<sup>7</sup> Elsewhere in the ninth century it was attributed to Cyprian, e.g., as early as 829 in the *Acta* of a synod at Paris, and on this authority by Jonas, Bishop of Orléans, in a letter (834), *De institutione regia ad Pippin regem*; by a Council at Metz (859)—all in citation of the ninth abuse. The St. Gall catalogue (841-72) lists it as Cyprian's; so, too, the twelfth-century catalogue of St. Vaast. But the book-list of Bec (*saec.* XII) names it among the titles of Ambrose; and that of Murbach (post 840) as the last item under Isidore's name, "Abusiva XII."<sup>8</sup>

However, there is not for Ambrose and Isidore any supporting evidence, as there is for Augustine and Cyprian, that either was considered the author; rather, the inclusion of the tract in this fashion alongside or following works of a specific writer, seems to indicate its complete anonymity in the particular library. And other "alleged attributions to Origen and to a certain Erardus are entirely fanciful."<sup>9</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Sedulius Scottus ("Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinische Philologie des Mittelalters," Vol. I, No. 1 [München, 1906]), p. 102.

<sup>5</sup> Becker, *Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqui* (Bonn, 1885), Nos. 10, 40, 18, 207, 37, 159, respectively.

<sup>6</sup> Hermann Bloch, "Ein karolingischer Bibliothekskatalog aus Kloster Murbach," *Strassburger Festschrift zur XLVI. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner* (Strassburg, 1901), p. 266. On St. Gall, St. Vaast, and Bec, cf. Becker, *op. cit.*, Nos. 23, 21, 125, 44, 127, 52, respectively.

<sup>7</sup> M. Esposito, "Notes on Latin Learning and Literature in Mediaeval Ireland. III," *Hermathena*, XXIII (1933), 229. Furthermore, Esposito points out that in a twelfth-century manuscript of Florence, first reported by Arevalo (and referred to by Hellmann, *Ps.-Cyprianus*, p. 20, n. 4), the *Abusiva* follows Isidore's *De origine creaturarum*, introduced by *Incipiunt dicta Sancti Ysidori De duodecim abusivis*, but with a correction, *Sancti Cipriani Martiris*, written by the scribe himself above *Ysidori* (Esposito, *op. cit.*, pp. 222-23).

<sup>4</sup> *Pseudo-Cyprianus de XII abusivis saeculi*, ed. Siegmund Hellmann ("Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur," ed. Harnack and Schmidt, Vol. XXXIV, No. 1 [Leipzig, 1909]), pp. 1-60 (Introd., pp. 1-30; text, pp. 32-60).

<sup>5</sup> *MGH, Epp.*, IV, ed. E. Duemmler (1895), 501-4.

Eight of the 9 oldest manuscripts (6, *saec.* IX, and 3, *saec.* IX/X) attribute the authorship to Cyprian. The first occurrence of Augustine's name in the manuscripts occurs in 2 of the eleventh century—Paris 15146 and Rouen 1333. In 1 codex of the tenth century—Brussels 14920-22—a fragment is included with works of Augustine; in 5 others the tract is assigned to Cyprian; in a seventh it is anonymous.

The *Abusiva* was edited by Hartel<sup>10</sup> from 3 manuscripts—St. Gall 89, *saec.* IX (G); Parisinus 18095 *olim* Notre Dame 228, *saec.* X (X);<sup>11</sup> and Vindobonensis 1010, *saec.* XI (V). Of these G<sup>1</sup> and X represent different recensions, G<sup>2</sup> and V a mixture of the two. Hartel's text was constituted on G<sup>1</sup>. Insular evidence in his apparatus is very slight, limited to errors which may have arisen from mistaking Insular symbols in the archetype, e.g., *autem* for *enim* X (154. 10 and 164. 7), *enim om.* V (154. 10 and 155. 23), X (157. 8); *ergo* for *igitur* V (157. 20), *qui* for *quod* X (157. 18), *tamen* for *tantum* G *in ras.* (160. 3).

Hellmann's edition, on the other hand, presents a full display of Insular traits. From approximately 50 manuscripts,<sup>12</sup> he chose as the basis of his text 9, divided into two families—II, composed of 5; and Φ, which consists of two classes, α and β, each of 2 manuscripts. The members of II are: Berlin Lat. 55 *olim* Phill. 1691, *saec.* XII (P); Zurich Rhein. 95, Part I, *saec.* IX/X (R); Oxford New Coll. 140, *saec.* XIII (F); Paris B.N. Lat. 2155, *saec.* XIII-XIV (A); B.N. Lat. 1651, *saec.* XIII (T). In Φ, Bern 618, *saec.* XI/XII (B) and St. Gall 277, *saec.* IX (S) = α;

<sup>10</sup> S. Thasci Caccili Cypriani opera omnia, ed. G. Hartel, CSEL, III, No. 1 (1868), 152-73. Superscript numbers 1 and 2 in Hartel's sigla designate, respectively, original and corrected readings.

<sup>11</sup> The date is corrected by Dom Wilmart to *saec.* IX (see Esposito, *Journal of Theological Studies*, XXXIII [1932], 113-14).

<sup>12</sup> He discounted several from von Soden's summary list of 79, printed in *Die Cyprianische Briefsammlung* ("Texte und Untersuchungen," Vol. XXV, No. 3 [1904]), pp. 223-24.

Metz 138, *saec.* XII (M) and St. Omer 267, *saec.* IX (O)<sup>13</sup> = β. Errors shared by II and Φ point to a common defective archetype; II represents the better tradition, both in readings and in the preservation of homoeoteleuton; in Φ, α is generally preferable to β.<sup>14</sup> All except R name Cyprian as author. In it alone of the ninth-century manuscripts the text is anonymous.

In support of his statement, "Alle diese Handschriften . . . lassen noch deutlich die Züge irischer Vorlagen durchschimmern," Hellmann specifies the following mistakes arising from misunderstanding of Irish symbols—*enim* for *autem* and *vice versa* (or omission of either), *con* for *eius*; letter confusions—*a* and *u*, *r* and *s*; the exchange of *enim* and *ergo*, *igitur* and *ergo* (from abbreviations); Insular orthography—*i* for *e* and *o* for *u*.<sup>15</sup> In MS R, which is the oldest representative of II, he reports the actual Insular symbols for *autem*, *enim*, *est*, *eius*, and *ergo*. Confusion of Insular letter-forms is evident in R's substitution of *r* for *s*: *posuipendit* for *parvipendit* (34. 15) *resenioribus* for *senioribus* (36. 4, *se senioribus* FAT *sua senioribus* P), *rectatoribus* (also S) for *sectatoribus* (48. 9), *commonire* for *communi se* (57. 2 *om.* BSMO), *rectabantur* for *sectabantur* (60. 3). At 51. 12 a later hand corrected what may have been *aduenir* to *aduenis*; at 39. 10 *rationis* is corrected from *sationis*. At 58. 12 *s* was copied as *f*, *fortiamur* for *sortiamur*; and at 57. 3 *r* as *p*, *ipsa* for *ira* (*iṛā*? *om.* BSMO). In some instances errors arose in R from abbreviations in the exemplar: *quam in rasura* for *quae* (43. 8, *quam* PO *quia* FT), *quando* for *quomodo* (37. 10), *qui* corr. to *quia* for *quod-cumque* (35. 14), *qui* for

<sup>13</sup> The script of O is wrongly identified as Insular by James F. Kenney, *Sources for the Early History of Ireland*, Vol. I: Ecclesiastical (New York: Columbia University Press, 1929), p. 281.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Hellmann, *Pseudo-Cyprianus*, pp. 27-28.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 30.

*quod* (35. 18; 39. 3, *quid* corr. to *quod* P; 39. 16); *quia* for *quae* (34. 11; 57. 1), *quia qui* for *qui quod* (33. 1), *quia* for *quod* (33. 10 om. BSMO; 56. 10, also FT *qui* A), *q* changed to *g*; (*quae*) for *quod* (45. 4), *quod* for *quia* (58. 6). Also *non* for *tamen* (34. 14; 36. 14), *con* (o) *i.m.* add. R for *eius* (s) om. TBSMO (48. 2), *contra i.m.* R *rasura i.t.* (49. 9), *ergo om. in ras.* 2 *litt.* (57. 17), *id est om.* RBSMO (58. 12). Other Insular features of R are the addition of *et rl* after *dominus* (57. 6); the use of single for double *s*, *pythonisarum* for *pythonissarum* (*phitonum sacrorumque* O; 51. 18); and the ending *hic finit liber* (60. 11).

The more conspicuous evidence found in the other manuscripts includes the abbreviation ·f· (imitative) B for *scilicet* (46. 11); letter confusions: *h* for *n*, *hominis* S for *nominis* (48. 1), *p* for *r*, *quippe est* A for *qui praeest* (45. 12), *r* for *s*, *dilectus* P for *dilector* (47. 19), *s* for *f*, *sit* O for *fuert* (33. 6), *sunt* FBS for *fiunt* (59. 17); errors caused by abbreviation symbols, *consciderunt* BSMO for *eius sciderunt* (58. 1; cf. above, 48. 2), *hoc* M for *haec* (47. 8), *que* PFAT for *quoque* (48. 1), *quam* M for *quoniam* (45. 10), *sed et* B for *scilicet et* (43. 15), *tamen* S for *tantum* (42. 16 om. P); interchange of *autem* and *enim*, as well as omission of either, *autem om.* F (54. 7), R (57. 12), B (37. 6), *enim* for *autem* R (37. 14 *vero* T *postea* P), R (54. 4), *enim om.* RFAT (33. 2, 4), P (40. 2), BSMA (45. 17), PBS (47. 10), BS (51. 5 *tamen* A), *autem* for *enim* BS (35. 8), P (39. 5), PRFA (47. 7 *ergo* BSMO), O (48. 12), FAT (54. 13); omission of *igitur* AO (39. 18), *ergo* for *igitur* BSMO (39. 3), T (58. 12), and *ergo* for *uero* RFAT (49. 18).

The *Abusiva* was apparently one of the most widely read books throughout the Middle Ages. Hincmar of Rheims in the second half of the ninth century, like Pseudo-Bede and Sedulius Scottus, drew

upon it *passim* in his numerous political treatises;<sup>16</sup> in the tenth century, Bishop Rather of Verona used the fifth paragraph and Abbo of Fleury the ninth, which Abaelard, Ivo of Chartres, and Gratian in the twelfth century incorporated into their several works. Hugo de Folieto (*obiit* 1176) knew and imitated it in his *De xii claustris abusibus*. Inevitably this title led to an erroneous attribution of the model to Hugh of St. Victor: in a 1483 edition of the opuscula of Augustine, printed at Venice, the Irish tract was published as *S. Augustini de xii abusorum gradibus libellus aut beati Ugonis de Sancto Victore ut verius*.<sup>17</sup>

In the meantime, the tract reappeared in the British Isles, among the Anglo-Saxons. It was used by Aelfric in the late tenth century for his homily, *De octo vitiis et de duodecim abusivis gradus*.<sup>18</sup> A translation of the whole is preserved among Anglo-Saxon sermons with Latin titles and biblical quotations in a late eleventh-century manuscript, Oxford Hatton 115 (Bodl. 5135 *olim* Junius 23).<sup>19</sup>

The character of the *Abusiva* led to redaction in the form of epigrams, mottoes, proverbs, both prose and verse in Latin and in the vernaculars of England and Germany. A poetical version in Latin rhymed verse is contained in a manuscript of Trinity College, Dublin, E. 4. 21, *saec. XIII*.<sup>20</sup> There are also English and German prose translations of the fifteenth century.

Even more impressive is the dissemina-

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 17, n. 7.

<sup>17</sup> Esposito, *Hermathena*, XXIII, 228.

<sup>18</sup> A homily "De octo vitiis & de duodecim abusivis huius seculi," which he considers a twelfth-century "transliteration (with here and there traces of translation or the substitution of a word more familiar to the scribe than that in the original copy)" of Aelfric's homily, was printed by Richard Morris from MS Lambeth Palace 487 ("before 1200") in *Old English Homilies* ("Publications of the Early English Text Society," Vol. XXIX [1868]), pp. xi, 101-18.

<sup>19</sup> C. H. Turner, *Early Worcester MSS* (Oxford, 1916), Appen. IV, p. lvi.

<sup>20</sup> Esposito, pp. 231-33.

tion illustrated by the Latin manuscripts of the *Abusiva* (saec. IX–XVII), scattered in libraries from York to Rome and from Lisbon to Warsaw. A list of over 200 is enumerated by Esposito, who judges it "far from being exhaustive":<sup>21</sup> 9 belong to the ninth century, 7 to the tenth, 9 to the eleventh, 32 to the twelfth, and 48 to the fifteenth; 21 contain merely excerpts or the index only. Cyprian is named as author in 94, Augustine in 73; more or less associated with works of either are 14. Of 58 in English libraries, the earliest are of the eleventh century—4 only. Not a single copy is reported from Ireland: and not one of the 16 ninth- and tenth-century manuscripts of the Continent is written in the Irish or Anglo-Saxon script. The unknown author's tract, brought by his fellow-countrymen to the Continent, was preserved abroad by non-Insular copyists, to become, eventually, the first work of an Irish author to appear in print.<sup>22</sup>

The writings of the Anglo-Saxon author, Aldhelm, likewise went into almost total eclipse in the homeland. Known manuscripts of Aldhelm listed by Ehwald<sup>23</sup> number 74. Of these, 3, which were used by editors in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, are now lost: the Abbey of St. Lawrence at Liège once owned a manuscript containing the *Aenigmata* and *Carmen de virginitate*, from which Martin Delrio printed the *Aenigmata* (Mainz, 1601); St. Bertin possessed a miscellaneous codex of verse, including Aldhelm's *Carmina ecclesiastica*, which was loaned by Jacob Sirmond to André Duchesne for his edition of Alcuin's poems (Paris, 1617); the convent of St. Martin at Cologne had a copy of the *Car-*

*men de virginitate*, which it loaned to Alexander Hegio and he, in turn, to Jacob Faber, who printed the first edition of the work (Deventer, 1513)—a task the more difficult "propter peregrinam et incognitam characterum, quibus exaratus esset archetypus, ductionem," conjectured by Ehwald to have been Insular script.<sup>24</sup> The age of these 3 is not known. The 71 others range from the eighth to the eighteenth centuries;<sup>25</sup> 9 are in Insular script, 2 are partly in Insular and partly in Continental minuscule; 3 show Insular features in decoration of initial letters, in letter forms, or in abbreviations; 7, written in Caroline minuscule, are shown by letter confusions to have been copied from Insular exemplars; 50 are devoid of paleographical characteristics of their Anglo-Saxon origin.

Of the 9 Insular items in Ehwald's *Index*, only 3 were written in England as early as the ninth century, and these are parts of the same Anglo-Saxon codex (*Prosa de virginitate*), viz., Cheltenham Phillips 8071 (26 fols.), Cambridge Univ. Add. 3330 (2 fols.), Oxford Bodl. Lat. th. f. 2 (1 fol.).<sup>26</sup> To these belong also 2 other fragments, Cheltenham Phillips 20688 (2 fols.)<sup>27</sup> and London Wilfred Merton Collection 41 (2 fols.)—a total of 33 leaves, the work of two scribes, whose writing resembles that of the Mercian charters.<sup>28</sup> In the eleventh century, English (Kentish?) glosses were entered by two hands using

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 347.

<sup>22</sup> Two saec. VIII; 3 saec. VIII/IX; 12 saec. IX; 9 saec. IX/X; 19 saec. X; 3 saec. X/XI; 11 saec. XI; 6 saec. XII; 1 saec. XIV; 2 saec. XV; 1 saec. XVII; 2 saec. XVIII.

<sup>23</sup> Designated by Ehwald as "Lat. th. f. 4" (cf. Madan, *Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, V [1905], 843), dated saec. X, and wrongly related by him to Würzburg, Mp. th. f. 21, saec. IX.

<sup>27</sup> For a facsimile of one page (fol. 19) see M. Guglielmo Libri, *Catalogue of the Extraordinary Manuscripts, etc.* (London, 1859), Pl. XXV(a).

<sup>28</sup> E. A. Lowe, "Membra disiecta," *Revue bénédictine*, XXXIX (1927), 191–92.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 228.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 227: "At the end of the 'Speculum Isidori de Summo Bono,' Ulric Tell, Cologne, 1470?," attributed to Cyprian.

<sup>23</sup> *Opera Aldhelmi*, ed. Rudolphus Ehwald, *MGH, Auctores antiquissimi*, XV (1913), 3–503; *Index codicum*, pp. 541–42.



Continental and English minuscule, respectively.<sup>29</sup>

There are two native English manuscripts in Anglo-Saxon minuscule of the tenth century, both containing the *Prosa de virginitate*: a codex *mutilus*, London B.M. Royal 5 F III, "in a Mercian hand,"<sup>30</sup> with contemporary interlinear glosses; and Royal 7 D XXIV, with interlinear Latin and (a few) English glosses added by the scribe. The second contains also a letter of Aldhelm, *Epist. ad Ehfri-dum* (Ehwald, No. 5).

The oldest fragment of an Anglo-Saxon minuscule codex preserved in England, Cambridge Univ. Add. 4219 (*saec.* VIII/IX), also of the *Prosa de virginitate*, originated on the Continent in a "Germanic centre with South English connexions."<sup>31</sup> It is part of a bifolium which was once used to reinforce a German bookbinding of the sixteenth or seventeenth century. It is unique in that it alone of the old manuscripts of the *Prosa* is written in two columns. The text is, in Ehwald's opinion,<sup>32</sup> very closely related to that of Würzburg Mp. th. f. 21. *saec.* IX.

Three other manuscripts, written by Insular copyists in their national script(s) on the Continent, date from the eighth and ninth centuries. They are: Leningrad Q I 15 *olim* Corbeiensis, *saec.* VIII *in.*; Gothanus I 75 *olim* Murbacensis (Part I), *saec.* VIII *med.*; Sangallensis 1394 (pp. 121-22, 125-28), *saec.* IX.

The first of these is a compilation, chiefly of theological works, in a variety of eighth-century Insular scripts, "Hiberno-Saxon" minuscule, Anglo-Saxon cursive and semicursive, by at least six or seven hands; a few instances of pre-Caroline and ninth-century Caroline minuscule

with cursive elements; and one of the distinctive Corbie en-type.<sup>33</sup> The 79 folios comprise eleven unnumbered quires of unequal composition; the last, a quaternion (fols. 72-79), contains the *Aenigmata* in Insular writing, which changes little by little within the gathering from a stiff minuscule to a careless cursive.<sup>34</sup> The diversity of script, content, and date led Lindsay to remark that the volume might be "really a combination of different MSS."<sup>35</sup>

The Gothanus is a composite of three codices, of which the first and second form Part I, an incomplete manuscript of Sedulius (fols. 1-22) and one of Aldhelm's *Carmen de virginitate* (fols. 23-69), both written, for the most part, in Anglo-Saxon minuscule of the eighth century.<sup>36</sup> Part II consists of a seventh-century half-uncial copy of the Dionysian Canons (fols. 70-122). The *Carmen* proper begins on folio 26. The *Praefatio* has been added on a bifolium (fols. 24-25) inserted between folios 23 and 26. Preceding it are verses of Hilary (fol. 23, the first leaf of the quaternion, originally left blank), and of Sedulius (fols. 23v-25r), all—like the *Praefatio* (fol. 25rv)—tenth-century additions, made, Ehwald suggests,<sup>37</sup> when the two manuscripts were united. In the *Carmen* appear four Anglo-Saxon hands: two of pointed minuscule; the third half-uncial; and the fourth round minuscule or half-uncial, less expert than the third.<sup>38</sup>

The St. Gall fragments are the remains of a two-column codex (with twenty lines per column) in Anglo-Saxon pointed

<sup>29</sup> A. Napier, *Old English Glosses* (London: Clarendon Press, 1900), pp. xvi-xvii, xxxii.

<sup>30</sup> Various dated IX (*vel octavo*), X *in.* and X *med.* (cf. Ehwald, *op. cit.*, p. 218).

<sup>31</sup> E. A. Lowe, *CLA*, II (1935), No. 136.

<sup>32</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 213.

<sup>33</sup> P. Liebart and W. M. Lindsay, *Some Early Scripts of the Corbie Scriptorium* ("Palaeographia Latina," Part I [1922]), pp. 62-63.

<sup>34</sup> Olga Doblas-Rozdestvenskaja, *Histoire de l'atelier graphique de Corbie* (Leningrad, 1934), p. 133.

<sup>35</sup> *Notae Latinae* (Cambridge, 1915), p. 487.

<sup>36</sup> Fols. 21-22, originally left blank, are written in Caroline minuscule, *saec.* IX; fols. 23-25 *saec.* X.

<sup>37</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 330.

<sup>38</sup> Facsimiles of fols. 26r and 34r, printed by Ehwald (*op. cit.*, *ad finem*), display three types.



minuscule written by an expert scribe. They consist of three leaves containing, respectively, portions of the *Tractatus de metris* (pp. 122-23 = 85. 21-87. 26), *et Enigmatibus* (pp. 127-28, Nos. XXIV. 2-XXXVI. 6 = 107-13), *ac pedum regulis* (pp. 125-26 = 190. 33-192. 17). A fourth leaf of this same manuscript, not known to Ehwald, exists in the binding of a ninth-century copy of Isidore which formerly belonged to St. Gall (Zofingen Stadtbibliothek P. 32). Its text is an earlier section of the *De pedum regulis*; in the facsimile published by A. Bruckner,<sup>39</sup> of thirteen lines only, column 1 = 180. 16-22 and column 2 = 180. 26-181. 3.

In 2 ninth-century codices a text of Aldhelm is written only partly in Insular script, with the greater amount in Caroline minuscule (Würzburg Mp. th. f. 21 and Paris B.N. Lat. 16668). The *Prosa de virginitate* in the Wirceburgensis exhibits Insular abbreviations and letter forms throughout the Carolingian writing, which more than once<sup>40</sup> is interrupted by a few lines in actual Anglo-Saxon pointed minuscule. The latter occurs in corrections also. This manuscript derives from an Insular exemplar (of Fulda?); from it, in turn, was copied the tenth-century Guelferbytanus *olim* Helmstediensis 365 from Mainz. Somewhat more extensive is the Anglo-Saxon element of the *Carmen de virginitate* in the Parisinus (fols. 23r-39r), despite a loss of verses 733-2482. In the *Praefatio* (fol. 23r. 1-23v. 7) the script of line 1 is round Insular in red, and, of the remainder, Anglo-Saxon half-uncial in lines blue, green, or brown, except that the first and last letters of each line are invariably red. The *explicit* and *incipit* (fol. 23v. 8-10) show the same variety of script and color scheme. In the body of the

text, which is written in minuscule, half-uncial lines also indicate new paragraphs—less often distinguished by color, except for the capital initial. These Insular features are paralleled in the text which precedes Aldhelm, Bede's *De arte metrica* (fols. 3-20).<sup>41</sup>

The significance of this relatively small number of extant manuscripts which were produced by Insular copyists can be appreciated only by recognition of their affiliations with other representatives of a given text and with a given place.<sup>42</sup> This is not equally possible in all cases.

Of the *Carmina ecclesiastica* there is no extant manuscript in England and none on the Continent written in an Anglo-Saxon hand. The poems are believed to have been circulated separately at first in Britain, in consequence of which, manuscript collections vary in content and order. Of the four codices used by Ehwald, the most complete is MS Berlin 167 Phillips 1825 from St. Aubin, Angers, *saec.* IX (A). It alone preserves traces of Carmen I in two centos preceding the *carmina*, which are disordered in sequence and marred by displacement and omission of lines. The name of Aldhelm nowhere appears in it. Sangallensis 869, *saec.* IX *ex.* (S) lacks also Carmen III, but has the rest—II, IV. i-xiii, V—in the correct arrangement. The author's name is missing. Parisinus 8313, *saec.* X/XI (P), has III properly inserted between II and IV, but V wrongly between IV. xii and IV. xiii. The last item, IV. xiii, was completed by a second hand, which wrote verses 3-7 and a subscription "Expt opuscula al dhe l mi." A few lines are lacking in IV. v and in V. There is no title for these poems or for the metrical Preface of the *Carmen de virginitate* on folio 80v.

<sup>39</sup> *Scriptoria medii aevi Helvetica*, Vol. III (Genf, 1938), Tafel XIII.

<sup>40</sup> *Viz.*, fols. 37r. 9-10; 41v. 7-11; 42v. 3-8 (the only instance commonly cited; cf. facsimile printed by Ehwald, *op. cit.*, ad finem); 47r. 12-15, 48v. 22-24.

<sup>41</sup> C. H. Beeson, "The Manuscripts of Bede," *CP*, XLII (1947), 81.

<sup>42</sup> This material is largely drawn from Ehwald's several *Praefationes* and his critical apparatus.

Vat. Reg. 251 from St. Benignus, Dijon, *saec.* X (V), offers the heading "Incipiunt Opuscula Aldhelm Epi/De Scā Maria et XII Aptis." In content and order V is so like P as to warrant its being considered a *gemellus*.

There is a common omission in APV (V. 8–10), which differentiates them from S; another in PV (IV. v. 5–9), where A has the lines at the conclusion of the poem (*post vs.* 16). Both A and P descend from Insular codices with glosses;<sup>43</sup> in addition to their confusion of *s* and *r* and *r* and *p*, A wrote *hc* for *nc* (*nunc* III. 83) and PV *nunc* for *hunc* (IV. vi. 13). A has *-bl* (*bunt*), where P reads incorrectly *-bant*, and *celast* for *celarunt cell.*; also *gresu* corrected to *gressu*, and *miseram* for *miseram*. S shows *fontes* for *sontes* and *fuste* for *sude* PV *rude* A (IV. vii. 5), *quem* for *quod* and *-que* for *quoque*. It ends with "FINIT." Only S was not written in France; yet it, in its order, apparently parallels the lost *Quercelandus* of St. Bertin.

There is in England no copy of the *De metris et enigmatibus ac pedum regulis* (= *Epistula ad Acircium*). This tract disappeared from the Islands at an early date. Only the middle section, the *Aenigmata*, recrossed the channel in the ninth century and reappeared at Canterbury and Bury St. Edmunds. All the manuscripts of this work derive from a codex in which occurred a transposition of text, probably through the fault of a copyist who inserted in the wrong place a few lines written in the margin of his exemplar. These are the conclusion and beginning, respectively, of paragraphs dealing with verbs compounded with the prepositions *ob* and *in*, inserted in the final sentence of a third, treating *con* (197. 16). The manuscripts divide into two classes on this point; the first contains the entire passage (196. 8–13); the second lost the latter half of the opening sentence concerned with

*in* (196. 12–13) and two words at the place where the insertion was entered.<sup>44</sup>

To the first class belong the MSS Carolingensis LXXXV *olim* Augiensis, *saec.* VIII/IX (K), and Parisinus 2339 *olim* Lemovicensis, *saec.* X *in.* (P<sup>1</sup>). They alone preserve a long section (90. 8 *Enumeratis* . . . *verrens* 92. 6), missing from manuscripts of the second class except Vat. Pal. 1753 *olim* Nazarianus, *saec.* IX (N), which has a portion (90. 8 . . . *argento* 90. 18) at the end of the tract. The close relationship of KP<sup>1</sup> is further demonstrated by common readings quite different from those of the second class (cf. 169. 9–11). Both are written in Caroline minuscule. K contains the whole work in unbroken sequence, whereas P<sup>1</sup> has the various parts in disorder. Alongside KP<sup>1</sup> stand the Insular fragments of St. Gall (S) and Zofingen (see above, p. 215). The textual agreement of these three is evidence that they derive from the same source.<sup>45</sup>

The Lorsch manuscript (N), the principal representative of the second class, is written in Caroline script like that of the "mixed" Paris B.N. Lat. 16668 (see above). It is the manuscript from which Angelo Mai edited the tract (1833), omitting the *Aenigmata*. Beginning with the *Capitula*, N exhibits the three parts of the work (fols. 78v–109v) in the proper order, except for the passage from the *De metris* (90. 8–18) added at the end of the *De pedum regulis*. There are a few interlinear corrections and marginal supplements by an Insular hand throughout. Evidence that N was collated with a manuscript of the first class is seen in its reading at 174.

<sup>43</sup> Both introduce the second sentence of this paragraph by adding *In praepositio*.

<sup>44</sup> For KP<sup>1</sup>S see Ehwald, *op. cit.*, p. 37. For Zofingen cf. the following: 180. 20—*exemplaria verborum* P<sup>1</sup> *exemplarum verborum* K Zof. *verborum exempla cell.*; 180. 27–28—*pertinet regulam* KP<sup>1</sup>Zof. *regulam pertinet cell.*; 180. 28—*an A et P<sup>1</sup> aut Zof. cell.*; 181—*quia qui K que P<sup>1</sup> q F<sup>1</sup> q* (expanded by a modern hand *acer. quod*) Zof.; 181. 2—*penultima* KP<sup>1</sup> Zof., *ultima cell.*; 181. 3—*titulantes* KP<sup>1</sup> Zof. *om. cell.*

<sup>45</sup> Ehwald, *op. cit.*, pp. 9–10.

18 *discretionis* KP<sup>1</sup> *divisionis* N with *discretionis* in the margin, and the doublet *divisionis discretionis* in 3 of the 5 other manuscripts of the second class.

Valentinianus 378, *saec.* IX *ex. aut* X *in.* (A<sup>1</sup>), a manuscript of St. Amand, written in Caroline minuscule, contains the *Capitula* and *De metris* up to *sicut poeta promisit dicens* (96. 2). Because its earlier folios parallel the contents and order of N preceding Aldhelm—viz., Marius Victorinus *De metris*, Proba *Cento*, Sergius *De finalibus*—Keil believed it to be copied from N, and in his edition of Victorinus relied upon it where N had undergone correction or the reading was uncertain.<sup>46</sup> Ehwald, while recognizing in the text of Aldhelm likeness between A<sup>1</sup> and N, finds a more general agreement among all the codices of this class and suggests, instead, that A<sup>1</sup>N derive from the same exemplar. Though incomplete, A<sup>1</sup> was copied from a manuscript of the whole, as is shown by the numbers of the *Capitula* and the *Incipit*.

Another Amandinus—Valenciennes 376 (A)—the work of several hands, in a script contemporary with A<sup>1</sup>, has only the *De pedum regulis* ending with *unde vernaculus* (185. 6, fols. 142v–151v). Preceding and following this are other grammatical and metrical treatises, Albinus *In Priscianum*, Donatus *De partibus orationis*, a fragment of Pompeius *De barbarismo*, Servius *De centum metris*. It, too, shares some readings with N but a greater number with the entire group. It may be regarded as a continuation of A<sup>1</sup>, probably copied from the same source as A<sup>1</sup>, but less accurately.

Brussels 4433, *saec.* X (F), consists of three fascicules written by several scribes. The first contains the *Capitula* and both parts of the tract minus the *Aenigmata*, followed by Servius *De centum metris*

(also in A); the second, *Enigmata* without Preface but with *capitula* xii–cxi repeated, followed by poems of Alcuin; the third (fols. 77–120), Aldhelm's *Carmen de virginitate*. That F came from the same archetype as N and A<sup>1</sup> appears from their common witness to corrections in it. At 69.4 after *trusit*, N has a mark *h* to signify an omission, A<sup>1</sup> a blank space of two lines, F a mark *d* in both text and margin but no supplementary note. At 75. 17–20 A<sup>1</sup> omitted *aliquantula . . . defloravi* but inserted it after *enigmatum* (76. 5); in F the passage has its proper place but also is repeated in the lower margin by a second hand (almost erased); N, which has the correct order, indicates the transposition seen in A<sup>1</sup> by dots before the first and after the last word, and after *enigmatum* (76. 5). The passage was omitted in the text of the original and supplied by a marginal entry.

Another Brussels manuscript, *olim* Nicolai Cusani, 9581–95, *saec.* X (F<sup>3</sup>), contains only the tract, not the *Aenigmata*, in a miscellany which includes Cassiodorus *De orthographia*, Augustinus *Ars et regula*, Cicero *De senectute*, and Seneca *Suasoriae*.<sup>47</sup> Its text *De metris ac pedum regulis* was probably copied from F.<sup>48</sup>

There is a paper manuscript of the tract alone, Leidensis 490 (b), copied in 1760 from a St. Bertin codex. The latter, if not a *gemellus* of F, was from a source near to it.<sup>49</sup>

Running through both classes is a strain of their Insular origin, which seems the more obvious for the first than for the second by reason of the Anglo-Saxon fragments. In K occur two significant abbreviations, *h* (*autem*) and *n̄n* (*nomen*); also elsewhere *q* (*quia*) K, NA<sup>1</sup> *quam* b, A<sup>1</sup>KN

<sup>47</sup> *Saec.* IX, according to E. K. Rand, who says it was written at Tours or some monastery under its influence (*A Survey of the Manuscripts of Tours*, I [Mediaeval Academy of America, 1929], 188).

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Ehwald, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 40.

<sup>46</sup> *Grammatici Latini*, VI (Leipzig: Teubner, 1874), viii, xii.

quae F<sup>3</sup>, N qu<sup>a</sup>i F, A<sup>1</sup> qui K que P<sup>1</sup> qua b, P<sup>1</sup>N quae A, KP<sup>1</sup> quae A, AK p F<sup>3</sup> que P<sup>1</sup>, N qu(a)e FP<sup>1</sup> quod A qui K, N q̄ A quae F<sup>3</sup>, im NF<sup>3</sup> tam F (tantum KP<sup>1</sup>), tam/// P<sup>1</sup> (tantum). Confusion of Insular letters is seen in s for f: *consessio confessio* N *confessio consessio* F (doublet; *confessio celt.*); r for n: *ueneratus* KP<sup>1</sup> for *uenenatus*; r for p: *serpisti* P<sup>1</sup> for *s(a)episti*, *arestas* F *sscr.* *per* for *apertas*, *archinnirata* N *del. archinnirata* FN for *archipirata*; n for r: *nr̄m* (nostrum) for *rostrum*; s for r: *adstipulatus* KP<sup>1</sup> *corr. -atur*, *prestulamur* P<sup>1</sup> for *praestulamur*, *capso* K (p for p<sup>2</sup>) *capro* P<sup>1</sup> for *capero*; r for s: *caesusa* F *caesusate* b *cessure* F<sup>3</sup> *cessurae* N for *caesurae*, *farcino* F for *fascino*, *Pelarga* P<sup>1</sup> for *Pelasga*, *uri* K *usi* F<sup>3</sup>P<sup>1</sup> for *ussi*. Cases of s for ss are: *admiso* KN, *asentatrix* P<sup>1</sup>N (s *sscr.*) *congesimus* P<sup>1</sup>, *digressise* N (s *sscr.*), *misus* F<sup>2</sup>KN, *p̄termisis* N, *posessio* F<sup>3</sup>; ss for s: *basia bassiant* F *bassias bassiant* F<sup>3</sup> *bassias bassiant* AP<sup>1</sup>N for *basia basiant*, *bassianus codd.*, *bassians* FF<sup>3</sup>P<sup>1</sup>, *cassibus* KN, *cassus* N, *cessura* F<sup>3</sup>P<sup>1</sup>, F<sup>3</sup>, A<sup>1</sup>N *censura* F<sup>3</sup> for *caesura*, *genessim* A<sup>1</sup>F<sup>3</sup>N, *grandissonus* P<sup>1</sup>, *occasurus* A<sup>1</sup>KN, *pertessum* FNP<sup>1</sup> *ptes sum* F<sup>3</sup>, *pertessum* ANP<sup>1</sup> *pte//sum* F for *pertaesum*, *pertessum sit* F *ptes sumpsit* P<sup>1</sup> *ptes sumpsit* NF<sup>3</sup> for *pertaesum sit*, *quesso* K for *quaeso*, *recusses* N, *simossius* N *bis*, for *Symphosius*, *sussuro* N for *susurro*, *teritisant codd. praeter* KP<sup>1</sup>F for *teritisant*, *uicesimo* N, A<sup>1</sup>P<sup>1</sup>. The typical Insular spelling of Terentius is seen in *terrentius* F *teritius* KP<sup>1</sup> *terentias* F<sup>3</sup>, *terrenti* P<sup>1</sup> *terrentii* N *tr̄entia fide prehendi* K for *Terenti Afri deprehendi*, *terrentio* KP<sup>1</sup>N, *errentius* F<sup>3</sup>.

MSS A<sup>1</sup>A emanate from the north of France, in the region where Continental acquaintance with Aldhelm began. From Perrona the Abbot Cellanus, between 675? and 706, wrote to Aldhelm a letter, attested by a quotation and by a briefer extract from the reply, contained in the *Gesta pontificum Anglorum* by William of Malmesbury. In the words "Quasi pen-

nigero volatu ad nostrae paupertatis accessit aures vestrae Latinitatis panagericus rumor," Ehwald suggests, Cellanus alludes to the *Epist. ad Acircium* (= *Tractatus de metris et enigmatibus ac pedum regulis*), and in "tuos bona lance constructos legimus fastos diversorum deliciis florum depictos," to the *Carmen de virginitate*.<sup>50</sup> He requests a favor, that Aldhelm send "paucos sermunculos . . . ad locum, ubi domnus Furseus [Irish founder of the monastery at Lagny and the first of Cellanus' predecessors at Perrona, 641-52] in sancto et integro pausat corpore." The complimentary tone of the single sentence preserved from Aldhelm's answer leaves no doubt that he complied. Through Cellanus, Perrona and then Corbie and St. Riquier became the centers of distribution of Aldhelm's works.<sup>51</sup>

The omission of the *Aenigmata* from A<sup>1</sup>AF<sup>3</sup>, the separation of them from the prose tract by P<sup>1</sup>F, the transfer in P<sup>1</sup>, and the lack in F of the acrostic-telestic Preface are indications that on the Continent at an early date the *Aenigmata*, considered inapposite to a treatise on meter but popularly received *per se*, went into circulation separately—contrary to the author's intention.

There are 17 manuscripts which transmit them so, and 3 of excerpts only. Two recensions are seen in them. The first—and original—form comprises three codices containing the *Aenigmata* with the metrical Preface—the Insular MS *Leinograd* Q I 15, *saec.* VIII (A),<sup>52</sup> Brussels 10615, *olim* Cusanus, *saec.* XII (F<sup>1</sup>), and its apograph Brussels 9799 (F<sup>2</sup>) of the same place and date. MS F<sup>1</sup> derives not from A but from an exemplar related to

<sup>50</sup> *Festschrift für Albert von Bamberg* (Gotha, 1905), p. 4.

<sup>51</sup> Traube, "Perrona Scottorum," *Sitzungsberichte der philos.-philol. u. hist. Cl. d. Kgl. bayer. Akad. der Wissenschaften*, 1900, pp. 492-94 ("Vorlesungen u. Abhandlungen," III [München, 1920], 110-12).

<sup>52</sup> Cf. above, p. 214.

it, possibly a *gemellus*. It is probable that the text of A was written at Perrona, copied, it may be, from a manuscript sent by Aldhelm to Cellanus.

The second recension, characterized by emendation of the more difficult readings and the introduction of glosses, includes all the other manuscripts of the *Aenigmata*, even KSP<sup>1</sup>NF, discussed above. As KSP<sup>1</sup> were shown to be linked together against NF, so here are little groups closely associated but no one manuscript so superior to all as to be regarded the chief representative. The *Aenigmata* are accompanied by the *proemium* in some manuscripts, in others not.

There is connection between P<sup>1</sup> and four others. Leiden Voss. 8° 15 xii, *saec.* X/XI, in part written by Ademar, *grammaticus* of Limoges (*obiit* 1034), was copied from P<sup>1</sup> after it had been corrected. The *Aenigmata* are followed by a unique epitome of the *De metris*<sup>53</sup> in this copy. From an exemplar of common origin with P<sup>1</sup> came two Parisini, B.N. Lat. 16700, *saec.* IX/X, and 8440, *saec.* X (an anthology, *mutilus*, with some titles of individual *aenigmata* in Tironian notes), and Lipsiensis I 74, *saec.* IX/X, also an anthology, written in the region of Orléans—all showing a transposition of lines in *Aen.* 100 (vss. 61–67 *post* vs. 43). The same transposition is seen in one of the four manuscripts preserved in England (E; see below).

From the Anglo-Saxon manuscript of which only fragments exist (S; see above, p. 214) is derived Bremensis 651, *olim* Sangallensis, *saec.* IX/X (S<sup>2</sup>). A third St. Gall codex, No. 242, *saec.* IX (S<sup>1</sup>), differs from these, having been subjected to much interpolation and capricious change. There is some agreement between it and Paris B.N. Lat. 2773, *saec.* XI, which has connection also with FN and Vat. Reg. 2078, *saec.* X, an anthology, as shown by

*Aen.* 96. 10. The Parisinus reads the verse *post Aen.* 94. 9; F has it in the lower margin of a folio on which the last line is *Aen.* 94. 1. In N and the Reginensis, which omitted it, it is supplied in the margins, in N by an Insular hand. At another point in the Reginensis a second hand testifies to the use of codices not now extant for a title to *Aen.* 23. Similar to this manuscript in total contents and in the text of Aldhelm (through *Aen.* 63. 11) is Parisinus 7540, *saec.* X, conjectured by Maleyn<sup>54</sup> to be a transcription of an Anglo-Saxon codex.

The four English codices are collections of *Aenigmata*. The oldest is London B.M. Reg. 15 A XVI *olim* Cantuariensis, *saec.* IX (B), written, according to Thompson,<sup>55</sup> not in England but in France. To its supplements were added in the tenth century, and in England there were bound with it some eleventh-century folios. MS B.M. Reg. 12 C XXIII, *saec.* X *in.* (B<sup>1</sup>), is remarkable on two counts: It is the first collection of Anglo-Saxon *aenigmata* with Symphosius, and it is the sole manuscript in England which contains any portion of the tract *De metris*. In it the *Aenigmata* and metrical Preface of Aldhelm are immediately preceded by that part of the tract which pertains to the *Aenigmata* (= 75. 21–77. 5, 77. 9–81. 8). Like B, it formerly belonged to Canterbury. The two are similar in titles but differ in text. An Oxford manuscript, Rawlinson C 697 *olim* Bury St. Edmunds, *saec.* IX/X (E) whose origin is in dispute (Germany?), agrees with B<sup>1</sup> in the *Incipit*, with P<sup>1</sup> in some places of text, with three French manuscripts of the same stock as P<sup>1</sup> in a transposition of lines, and in its corrections with B<sup>1</sup> and another Canterbury manuscript, Cambridge 1567 Gg V 35 (C), *saec.* XI. The latter, a *Corpus poetarum*

<sup>54</sup> A. Maleyn, *De aenigmatibus Aldhelmi* (Petropoll, 1905), pp. 97 ff.

<sup>55</sup> *Catalogue of Ancient MSS in the Brit. Mus.*, II, 74.

<sup>53</sup> Published by Ehwald, *Opera Aldhelmi*, pp. 206–7.



*Christianorum*, the most extensive collection of its kind, was written by an Englishman, but whether at home or abroad is not known. The text, though much emended, appears to be from the same exemplar as B<sup>1</sup>; the two agree in titles and in the misplacement of *Aen.* 23 before *Aen.* 50.

MS Einsidlensis 302, *saec.* X, an anthology of Christian poets—some, in common with C, written in two columns (as KS)—appears to be related to the lost Codex Leodiensis, from which Delrio published the *Aenigmata*.

The three excerpt manuscripts show the widest range of date; the earliest is Leningrad F XIV 1, *saec.* VIII/IX, which contains about fifty *aenigmata* in very corrupt form among various works of Christian poets. The script is the ab-type of Corbie, where it may have been written;<sup>56</sup> but, as Traube pointed out,<sup>57</sup> this script must have prevailed throughout the region, and St. Riquier near by may have been the place of origin. The second is Wolfenbüttel Gudianus 331, *saec.* X/XI, with seventeen excerpts; the third, Vat. Pal. 591, *saec.* XV, with the prologue and about twenty selections.

For the *Prosa de virginitate* the picture, at first glance, seems to present a different state of affairs. English manuscripts outnumber the Continental by a ratio of 3 to 1. But this reckoning does not take into account the date and relative importance of the individual codices. The earliest manuscript authority extant—the Cambridge fragment, Univ. Add. 4219, *saec.* VIII/IX—was written in Germany by an Anglo-Saxon copyist in his native script. Of 2 ninth-century codices, one is English, written in Anglo-Saxon minuscule (Oxford-Cambridge-Cheltenham-London Merton fragments), the other is German, written in Continental minuscule, with here and there an outburst of Anglo-

Saxon pointed script. The rest are tenth- to seventeenth-century manuscripts, 14 English, of which only 2 are in Insular script, and 2 Continental, in Caroline and late minuscule hands.

The manuscripts divide into two classes, the first containing the pure recension, the second an interpolated version. Foremost in the first is Würzburg Mp. th. f. 21, *saec.* IX (A), described above (p. 215). According to an inscription, partially effaced, on the upper margin of folio 1, it was written for Gozbaldu, bishop of Würzburg, 842–55. It was probably copied from an Insular exemplar of Fulda, where it is known there were codices of Aldhelm.<sup>58</sup> A century earlier, Lullus, the follower of Boniface and eventually archbishop of Mainz, had sent a letter from this region of Germany to Dealwin, *magister* at Malmesbury, requesting “*aliqua opuscula seu prosarum seu metrorum seu rithmicorum . . . ad consolationem peregrinationis meae et ob memoriam ipsius beati antestitis.*”<sup>59</sup>

The Wolfenbüttel manuscript, Helm. 365 (*olim* Moguntinus), *saec.* X, is a slavish and stupid copy of the Würzburg codex. In many instances the copyist inserted into the text both Latin and German glosses of his exemplar, then corrected some of these by erasing both text and gloss and re-writing *in rasura*, leaving blank spaces on either side, both before and after, the words of the text with the gloss suprascript. He committed errors through failure to understand and expand properly the Insular abbreviations of the original.

Closely related to A are the (German) Insular fragment of Cambridge, *saec.* VIII/IX, and the (English) Anglo-Saxon codex, *saec.* IX, of which 33 folios are

<sup>56</sup> Doblas-Rozdestvenskaja, *op. cit.*, p. 158.

<sup>57</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 493.

<sup>58</sup> F. Falk, “Beiträge zur Rekonstruktion der alten Bibl. Fuldensis,” *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, *Beih.* 26 (1902), pp. 95, 101.

<sup>59</sup> *MGH, Epp.*, III (1892), 338, No. 71.



scattered among four libraries in England (see above, p. 213).

One tenth-century manuscript also belongs to this class, Brussels 1650, written in England in Caroline minuscule, with English glosses and grammatical notation of the sort generally miscalled *neums*, common in schoolbooks of the Middle Ages. From it was copied the seventeenth-century MS Brussels 4164-66.

The interpolated recension, so-called from the insertion of excerpts from cap. xxxvii at the beginning of cap. xxx, is entirely English but probably does not antedate the tenth century. Another characteristic, shared by the majority of this class, is a table of *capitula* prefixed to the text and division of the chapters within the text by title and number. The exceptions are Lambethanus 200, *saec.* X (from Waltham), with Insular initials and first lines in green lettering, and Herefordensis P 1 17, *saec.* XII (from Cirencester), with capital initials in red and blue or red and green.

Bodl. Digby 146, *saec.* X, written in ordinary minuscule, with an admixture of Anglo-Saxon abbreviations and letters, Latin and English glosses, and grammatical notes, came from Abingdon, whose eleventh-century abbot, Faricius, was the first man to write the life of Aldhelm.

Besides the two British Museum manuscripts written in tenth-century Anglo-Saxon minuscule (see above, p. 214),<sup>60</sup> there is a (Caroline minuscule) Cantuariensis, Cambridge CCC 326, *saec.* X, with an entry of the scribe in a mixture of Latin, Greek, and Anglo-Saxon vocabulary, and another of the eleventh, Bodl. 97, derived from the same archetype as London B.M. Royal 7 D XXIV, *saec.* X,

and Salisbury 38, *saec.* XI, copied from an Insular exemplar. Related to these three are two eleventh-century codices, B.M. Royal 6 A VI and 5 E XI, both with Latin and English marginalia and glosses and grammatical *notae*, the latter in common with the majority of this class. Closely connected with each other are Royal 6 B VII and Harl. 3013, both *saec.* XII. There is also a fourteenth-century manuscript, written in two columns, Cambridge Caius Coll. 687.

The early tradition of the *Carmen de virginitate* also is Continental. The manuscripts, in general, separate into two classes, the first of which is the older and more numerous, even discounting members contaminated with the second (of tenth-century English origin).

The oldest manuscript, and the chief representative of the first class, is the Gothanus I 75, *saec.* VIII (A).<sup>61</sup> Its text, written by Anglo-Saxon scribes, was copied from an Insular exemplar at the Alsatian monastery of Murbach, which was much frequented by Anglo-Saxon and Irish monks abroad. At St. Gall, another scriptorium of long-standing commerce with the Islands, were written three Caroline minuscule manuscripts, derived, though less directly, from the same archetype as A. Two of these—Zurich C 59/274, *saec.* IX (S) and St. Gall 263, *saec.* X (S<sup>2</sup>)—are closer to A than is the third, St. Gall 242, *saec.* IX/X (S<sup>1</sup>). The latter is the only member of this family which includes the *Praefatio* as an integral part; in each of the others it is a tenth-century addition. MS S<sup>1</sup> shows many other differences, some unique (probably the result of an attempt at

<sup>60</sup> The Insular codex *mutilus*, Royal 5 F III, is deficient, having lost most of capp. xxvii-xxxiv (a quaternion) and the first part of the *capitulatio*. It has no numbers in the text but individual rubrics. On the basis of its index and titles it belongs to the *interpolati*.

<sup>61</sup> Nearest to it in date but not otherwise comparable is the excerpt manuscript, Leningrad F XIV 1, *saec.* VIII/IX (R), from St. Riquier and Corbie, which contains selections from the *Aenigmata* and from the first half of the *Carmen* minus the *Praefatio*, both inferior texts and the *Carmen* particularly corrupted by the caprice of the excerptor through inversion, transposition, insertion, omission, etc.

"editing" for school use), some in common with another group descended from a different archetype.

At Lorsch and Limoges, where the works of Aldhelm were also read and copied, codices of this class were transcribed. Paris B.N. Lat. 2339, *saec.* IX/X (P<sup>1</sup>), a Caroline minuscule manuscript from Limoges, shows some affiliation with the text of B.N. Lat. 16668, *saec.* IX (N), the Lorsch manuscript of mixed scripts, described above (p. 215), though in P<sup>1</sup> the *Praefatio* was added by a contemporary hand, while N had it originally. In its corrections, P<sup>1</sup> is related to three *mutili*—Parisinus 16700, *saec.* IX/X, Bruxellensis 4433, *saec.* X,<sup>62</sup> and Pommersfeldensis 2883, a paper manuscript, *saec.* XV.

At Mainz the MS Vienna 969, *saec.* X (V), was copied from an Insular exemplar. V is related to S<sup>1</sup>, perhaps derived from the hybrid archetype of S<sup>1</sup>. Both have the *Praefatio* and identical transposition of lines.

There are fragments from Wertheim (one double folio, *saec.* IX) and from Munich (CLM 23486, *saec.* XI, with notes and glosses, Latin and German); and at Bamberg some *excerpta* of Alcuin (B II 10, *saec.* X) show a text like that of S<sup>2</sup>.

The earliest manuscript preserved in England is Oxford Rawl. C 697, *saec.* IX/X (E), a Caroline minuscule manuscript. Its archetype was closest to that from which S<sup>2</sup> came. It contains grammatical notes and some Insular marginalia. Corrections were entered in E from an archetype of the second class.

The Cambridge corpus (1567 Gg V 35, *saec.* XI) of uncertain provenance, has readings both of the A recension and of the second class.

The second class is composed of manu-

scripts which, like those of the corresponding (English) recension of the *Prosa*, have undergone correction of an editorial nature, evidenced by the removal of rarer, more difficult words or by emendation of obscure and seemingly erroneous—or offensive—elements. The oldest representative is a Caroline minuscule manuscript—Oxford Bodl. 577, *saec.* X; the sole member in Insular script is Oxford Bodl. 49, *saec.* X/XI. From their archetype also descended Cambridge CCC 285, *saec.* XI. A single twelfth-century manuscript, whose text agrees, in the main, with the Insular copy, is preserved on the Continent—Gand 264a.

Reference has been made twice in the foregoing discussion to letters written by Aldhelm. For seven of the ten which Ehwald edited, William of Malmesbury's *Gesta pontificum Anglorum* is the only source. The three others are preserved in the celebrated collection of the correspondence of Boniface, contained in Part I of Vienna 751, *saec.* IX; and one of them, the well-known *Epistula ad Efridum*, also in seven codices of English libraries. In six it accompanies the *Prosa de virginitate*—viz., B.M. Royal D XXIV, Bodl. Digby 146, Salisbury 38, all *saec.* X; B.M. Royal 6 A VI, *saec.* XI; Harl. 3013, *saec.* XII; and Cambridge Caius Coll. 687, *saec.* XIV. The seventh—B.M. Cotton Domit. A 9, *saec.* X—includes it among miscellaneous items.

The Vienna manuscript was copied from an Anglo-Saxon exemplar at Fulda or at Mainz. In the late ninth century it passed to Cologne and thence in the sixteenth to Vienna.<sup>63</sup> Its derivation and its early history conform to the pattern observed in the transmission of the literary works of Aldhelm.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[To be concluded]

<sup>62</sup> Designated as F for the *Aenigmata* and *Prosa* (above, p. 217). Note the relation of F to another Lorsch manuscript in mixed scripts, Vat. Pal. 1753 (p. 217).

<sup>63</sup> E. Duemmler, *MGH, Epp.*, III, 221.

**H**ECATAEUS of Abdera,<sup>1</sup> a younger contemporary of Alexander the Great, reported on a strange Apollon cult, flourishing in what to him seemed the far north and attributed to the "Hyperboreans," that is, the Celts living along the shores of the North Sea between the mouths of the Meuse and the Elbe.<sup>2</sup> There was settled, in a certain island, which our author calls "Helixioia," a people that worshiped the god in a round temple adorned with many ex-votos. He adds that from of old there had been intercourse between these "Hyperboreans" and the Greeks, so that what he says is really nothing new to his readers.

The latter statement is certainly true. Pindar, in his tenth Pythian ode, describes the god's rejoicing at the leaps of ithyphallic<sup>3</sup> donkeys, which are being sacrificed to him among the Hyperboreans. Callimachus,<sup>4</sup> who can hardly have drawn on Hecataeus for this particular, twice refers to this ass sacrifice; so does Simmias of Rhodes.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Diod. Sic. ii. 47; Frag. 5 (FHG, III, 387); Aelian *Hist. anim.* xi. 1. On Hecataeus cf. *RE*, XIV, 2750 ff.

<sup>2</sup> The identification of these "Hyperboreans" with the Celts of northwestern Europe goes back to Posidonius of Apamea (cf. Frag. 90 [FHG, III, 290]). It has been accepted, in modern times, by such authorities as H. d'Arbois de Jubainville (*Les premiers habitants de l'Europe* [Paris, 1889-94], I, 238 ff.; II, 311 ff. and 393), Karl Müllenhoff (*Deutsche Altertumskunde* [Berlin, 1887-1900], II, 296), and Henri Hubert (*The Celts* [London, 1934], I, 6 and 25).

<sup>3</sup> This interpretation is questioned by Miss L. Lawler, *CP*, XLI (1946), 155 ff. She does not deny, however, that the word ἰθυφάλλος (l. 36), when applied to animals, often enough has a sexual implication. In fact, it is the exact equivalent of the German *Üppigkeit*, which appears to have an analogous etymology.

<sup>4</sup> *Frgs.* 187 and 188 (ed. O. Schneider).

<sup>5</sup> *Apud* Antoninus Liberalis *Metam.* 20 (ed. Martin). On Simmias of Rhodes cf. *RE*, II. Reihe, V, 155 ff.

These texts would appear to establish two sets of facts: (1) There was an Apollon cult among the Hyperboreans of the North Sea coast and (2) the sacrificial animal of the deity was the donkey. So the question arises: Are these two facts reconcilable?

One might observe, in the first place, that Hecataeus does not say a word about the ass sacrifice; but no valid conclusion can be drawn from this silence, since Diodorus Siculus has preserved but an excerpt of his source and may not have included this feature, even if it did occur in Hecataeus.

Far more serious is another objection. The donkey is definitely not an animal of northern and north-central Europe. John Hunter states that "in the reign of Queen Elizabeth the breed was extinct in this kingdom, and to this day in Norway and Sweden, an ass is never seen but as a curiosity in the stables of the great."<sup>6</sup> From his own childhood the writer remembers a campaign waged by charitable souls in Belgium and the adjacent Rhineland urging the abolition of the use of dogs as draft animals (for carts and other light vehicles) and the introduction of donkeys, virtually unknown in that region, in their place. There is no Teutonic or Celtic word denoting this useful animal: Ir. *assan* (whence OE *assa* > E. *ass*), W. *asyn*, Corn. *asen*, Bret. *azen*, Goth. *asilus* (> G. *Esel*), all are derived from Lat. *asinus*. Hence the bewilderment of Wilamowitz: "Es bleibt rätselhaft, wie man ein Tier, das

<sup>6</sup> Sir Richard Owen (ed.), *Essays and Observations in Natural History, Anatomy, Physiology, Psychology, and Geology* (by John Hunter), *Being His Posthumous Papers on Those Subjects* (London, 1861), I, 59.

der Hellene nicht opferte, und das im Norden nicht heimisch ist, als Opfer der frommen Bewohner des apollinischen Gartens einführen konnte."<sup>7</sup>

This negative result is fully borne out by Aristotle, who, speaking of the Celts beyond Spain (i.e., in Gaul), states that the climate is so cold there that the donkey cannot be born in those lands.<sup>8</sup> This means that in the fourth century before our era the ass was not yet completely acclimatized in the countries north of the Alps and the Pyrenees.<sup>9</sup>

There remains only one solution of the problem: Pindar, Callimachus, and Simmias confused two different Apollon cults, one credited to the Hyperboreans and in which the donkey was conspicuous only by its absence, the other, flourishing in some region more congenial to it and in which it was, accordingly, the sacrificial animal of the god.

This conclusion is not so desperate as it may seem: in fact, it is confirmed by Simmias, who tells the following tale:

In Mesopotamia, near Babylon, lived a wealthy and god-fearing man named Kleinis, owner of herds of cattle, donkeys, and sheep. He was a particularly ardent worshiper of Apollon and Artemis, and frequently accompanied these deities to the temple of Apollon among the Hyperboreans, where he witnessed the sacrifice of donkeys to the god.<sup>10</sup>

The story goes on to relate that, having once returned to Babylon, Kleinis decided to adopt the Hyperborean custom but was told preemptorily by the god to desist and to continue sacrificing goats, sheep, and cattle, for donkeys were welcome only when coming from the Hyperboreans.

<sup>7</sup> U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Pindaros* (Berlin, 1922), p. 128.

<sup>8</sup> *De gen. anim.* II. 8. Even the Basque word *asto*, "ass," is derived from the Latin.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. also H. d'Arbois de Jubainville, *Cours de littérature celtique*, XII (1902), 55 f.

<sup>10</sup> Anton. Lib. *Metam.* 20.

Now the modes of transportation in antiquity were not such as to make it an easy matter for a man residing in Babylon to make a sort of pilgrimage to the North Sea coast, there to witness the cult acts performed in honor of an exotic deity. The site of this Apolline ass sacrifice must therefore have been considerably closer to Babylon if any credit is to be given to the narrative.

Wilamowitz' understandable bewilderment at the report of Hecataeus was increased by the fact that the Greeks were not in the habit of sacrificing donkeys and that this useful animal plays a very negligible part in the Olympian religion. It is thus inadmissible to claim, with some, that Hecataeus (or his authority) may have transferred to the Hyperboreans a custom current in Greece.<sup>11</sup>

This fact is of greater importance than would seem at first blush. As is well known, the Hellenic Olympians are by no means purely Indo-European creations. Behind most of them lurk pre-Hellenic and Anatolian divinities, whom the invaders from the north found firmly established in continental Greece and in the islands and whom they thought it convenient to identify or fuse with the Olympians. So we ask: Is there any trace, in Aegean lands, of some connection of Apollon with the donkey? We shall see that there is indeed.

There is, in the first place, 'Απόλλων Κιλλαιῶς,<sup>12</sup> whose cult flourished in Mysia, where he had a famous shrine in the town of Killa. In the same region, Strabo (xiii. 1. 62) attests the existence of a

<sup>11</sup> Cf., e.g., Boeckh (*ad CIG*, I, 807. 14): "non Graeci Hyperboreos fecissent Apollini asinorum hecatomben offerentes nisi in Graecia quoque asini mactati Apollini essent." The conclusion is faulty because, after all, the Greeks may very well have observed ass sacrifices in the Near and Middle East and, by analogy, have ascribed the custom to the Hyperboreans.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. *RE*, XXII, 392.

Κίλλαιον ὄνος and a Κίλλαιος ποταμός. At the shrine of Killa there also was a Κίλλου μνήμα, which was linked up, we do not know on what authority, with the name of the legendary charioteer of Pelops. All this precludes, of course, the possibility of the god's being called after the town, and we inquire next into the meaning of the name.

The clue is furnished, as so often, by the lexicographers. Thus Pollux (vii. 56) informs us that Κίλλον τὸν ὄνον οἱ Δωριεῖς καὶ κλλακτῆρα τὸν ὄνηλάτην.<sup>13</sup> As has been repeatedly suggested, this name, Κίλλος, points to the movability of the donkey's ears, just as the σεισοπυγίς (presumably a wagtail species) is also named Κίλλουρος in Hesychius.<sup>14</sup> To this another rather significant feature must be added. The Κίλλου μνήμα cannot very well be separated from the μνημεῖα Σιληνοῦ in the land of the Hebrews<sup>15</sup> and in Pergamon.<sup>16</sup> They would seem to favor the view that we are dealing with a "dying god" of the Attis and Adonis type, whose passing was presumably commemorated by annual mourning rituals.

However this may be, the cult of Ἀπόλλων Κίλλαῖος is clearly pre-Hellenic<sup>17</sup> and points to Asia Minor as its diffusion center. It is, however, by no means an isolated phenomenon. In the town of Priapos, on the shores of the Propontis (in the Troad) there flourished a cult of Ἀπόλλων Πριαπαῖος, that is, of an Apollon assimilated to the god Priapos, whose cult center (or one of them) was the town of Lampsakos. As a matter of fact, there was a tradition according to which Priapos, driven away from Lampsakos by the

angry husbands (with whose wives he had evidently taken undue liberties), found refuge and asylum in Priapos.<sup>18</sup> Now the sacrificial animal of Priapos at Lampsakos was the ass.<sup>19</sup> Alexandrian and Roman antiquity was in complete ignorance of the underlying reason and sorely puzzled by it. As in so many other cases (*inter alia*, the goat sacrifice to Dionysos), it was explained on the basis of some enmity of old standing between the god and the animal. These stories, rather amusing though of doubtful morality, contribute nothing to the main problem and may conveniently be read in the classical sources.<sup>20</sup>

Of greater significance is another tradition telling how Priapos engaged in a contest with the donkey of Dionysos on the grave question of which of the two, the donkey or Priapos, could boast of a more perfect organ of generation. According to one group of authorities, Priapos lost and, in a fit of anger, slew his rival.<sup>21</sup> According to others, the god won; but the donkey, in compensation, as it were, was put among the stars of the nightly sky.<sup>22</sup> These stories are significant in that they show the close association of the god with the ass and, at the same time, intimate quite clearly the reason of this association. Even more significant is a passage of Afranius,<sup>23</sup> in which Priapos appears to defend himself against the charge that he is the son of a jackass.

The son of a jackass, of course, is a jackass himself—an inference confirmed by the law, first formulated by Salomon

<sup>13</sup> Serv. ad Verg. Georg. iv. 111.

<sup>14</sup> Ovid Fast. i. 391, 440; vi. 345; cf. also Lactant. Div. inst. i. 21; Myth. Vat. iii. 6. 26, ed. G. H. Bode (Celle, 1834 [*Script. rer. myth. Lat. tres*]).

<sup>15</sup> Ovid Fast. i. 391-440; Metam. ix. 347 f.; Serv. ad Verg. Georg. ii. 84; Myth. Vat. i. 126; ii. 179; iii. 6. 26; Ovid Fast. vi. 319-45; Lactant. Div. inst. i. 21.

<sup>16</sup> Lactant. De falsa relig. i. 22.

<sup>17</sup> Hygin. Astron. 33.

<sup>18</sup> In Macrob. Saturn. vi. 5. 6.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. also Hesychius, s.vv. Κίλλαι and κίλλος.

<sup>14</sup> De Witte, *Revue numismatique*, 1864, pp. 16 ff.

<sup>15</sup> Paus. vi. 24. 8.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*; cf. also E. Thraemer, *Pergamos* (Leipzig, 1888), p. 368.

<sup>17</sup> *RE*, XXII, 392.



Reinach, that a deity's sacrificial animal and etiological stories telling of an enmity between the god and the animal point to the god's beast-shape in the theriomorphic stage of religious evolution. On this showing, Priapos, and with him 'Ἀπόλλων Πριαπαῖος, would originally have been ass-shaped divinities.

This conclusion is corroborated, however indirectly, by the following consideration. Priapos of Lampsakos was the patron saint of truck-gardeners. Now it is a well-known fact, attested by Boccaccio, among others, that the skull of an ass set up on a pole in a wheat field is a potent charm against blight. In a modern parallel we are told that at Mourzac, in central Africa, the people set up the head of an ass in their gardens to avert the evil eye from their crops.<sup>24</sup>

Western Anatolia knew still another such divinity, to which we must now turn, the famous Marsyas. Marsyas is variously described as a Silenus or Satyr living at Kelainai (Phrygia). The story current about him ran as follows: Athena, having invented the double flute, threw it away when she noticed that playing this instrument detracted from her beauty. Marsyas picked it up and, proud of his talents as a flute-player, challenged Apollon to a contest. The god vanquished him by his play on the cithara and, in a fit of anger, punished Marsyas by flaying him alive.<sup>25</sup>

The first part of this story may be safely neglected. As Salomon Reinach<sup>26</sup> clearly saw, one tradition attributed the

invention of the flute to Athena, another to Marsyas. Our tale is merely an attempt to harmonize the two versions.

Of far greater importance is the second part of the narrative: the barbarous punishment meted out to the unfortunate Silenus; for in historical times the hide of Marsyas, hung up in a grotto, the source of the Marsyas River,<sup>27</sup> was shown at Kelainai as proof visible of the truth of the ancient tradition.<sup>28</sup> It was even fabled to tremble at the sound of the double flute.<sup>29</sup> Since the Sileni were generally thought to be beast-shaped,<sup>30</sup> it follows that the hide in question must have been that of some quadruped.

This Marsyas was, however, more than an ordinary Satyr. Pausanias (x. 30. 9) leaves no doubt that with the Phrygians he was a god:

The Phrygians of Kelainai claim that the river which traverses their town in former times was the famous flute-player Marsyas, to whom they ascribe the invention of the tunes sacred to the mother of the gods; they add that in times of old they repulsed an invasion of the Galatae thanks to the help of Marsyas, who turned away the barbarians by the floods of his river and by the sound of his flute.

Local tradition closely accords with the report of the Greek traveler. Marsyas, it was claimed, had been wept not only by the nymphs and by his own disciple, named Olympos; Apollon himself was fabled to have been seized with remorse and to have broken his lyre.<sup>31</sup> From Marsyas' blood the Satyrs were said to have sprung, while the river was supposed

<sup>24</sup> Cf. *Notes and Queries*, VII (1st ser., 1853), 496; O. Jahn, *Ber. d. Sächs. Gesellsch. d. Wissensch. zu Leipzig, philos.-philol. Cl.*, VI (1854), 48, n. 77; F. T. Elworthy, *The Evil Eye* (London, 1895), p. 121.

<sup>25</sup> O. Jessen, in Roscher, *Lex.*, II (2), col. 2439; cf. also *RE*, XXVIII, 1988. On the pictorial representations of the story cf. A. Caputi, "Marsyas religatus" in *Rendiconti della R. Accademia dei Lincei, classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, XIX (5th ser., 1910), 887-932.

<sup>26</sup> *Cultes, mythes et religions*, IV (1912), 29 f.

<sup>27</sup> On the identity of this river with the modern Dineir-Su, a tributary of the Mendere (the ancient Malandros), cf. Sir William M. Ramsay, *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia* (Oxford, 1895-97), II, 399.

<sup>28</sup> *RE*, XXVIII, 1988.

<sup>29</sup> Aelian *Var. hist.* xiii. 21.

<sup>30</sup> E. Kuhnert, in Roscher, *Lex.*, IV, cols. 444 ff.

<sup>31</sup> Ovid *Metam.* vi. 383 ff.; *Myth. Vat.* i. 125; Diod. Sic. v. 75. 3.



to have had its origin in the tears of the mourners.<sup>32</sup> All this at once reminds us of the inferences drawn from the *μνημεῖα Σιληνοῦ*: Like Apollon Killaios, Marsyas was a "dying god," whose "passion" was commemorated in ritual. In fact, we know that his tomb was shown at Pessinous, a center of the cult of Kybele;<sup>33</sup> and there are still other features that link him with the great Anatolian goddess.<sup>34</sup>

Marsyas would thus appear to have been an ancient Phrygian divinity, who, because he was classed with the Sileni, must have been beast-shaped. Now the typical animals associated with this class of demons were the donkey and the mule; when represented in human shape they are generally mounted on mules. Whence it has been concluded, rightly, that, prior to their anthropomorphic stage, they were themselves donkeys or mules. As a matter of fact, the fragment of a painting found at Mycenae represents a procession of ass-headed demons, no doubt the lineal ancestors of the Sileni.<sup>35</sup> Since religious tradition is most conservative, one will easily understand why in the famous Dionysiac procession of King Ptolemy Philadelphus, described by Athenaeus (v. 196 ff.), several hundred Sileni and Satyrs, companions of Dionysos, are riding on donkeys or mules, though horses would evi-

dently have much improved the splendor of the ceremony.<sup>36</sup> Bion of Prokonnesos<sup>37</sup> relates that the wise Silenus was captured by Midas at the spring of Inna ("the Mule") on the frontier of the Maedi and the Paeonians. Artemidorus (ii. 12) interprets the appearance of a donkey in a dream as of good augury, since the animal is sacred to the *ἡδίστος δαίμων Σιληνός*.<sup>38</sup>

Nor is this all. The tradition of Kellainai repeatedly introduces the well-known King Midas<sup>39</sup> into the legendary cycle of Marsyas. Midas is made to act as umpire in the musical contest of Apollon and Marsyas.<sup>40</sup> A Phrygian himself, he naturally sides with his compatriot and protests against the adverse judgment. The Marsyas River was fabled to have sprung from a source which Dionysos had struck off old as a favor to his friend Midas.<sup>41</sup> Both Midas and Marsyas are Satyrs<sup>42</sup> and are connected with the cult of Kybele at Pessinous.<sup>43</sup> On the other hand, the famous story of the donkey-ears of Midas sufficiently reveals the true nature of the mythical king: he was an ass-shaped divinity.

This fact is brought out even more strongly by a significant passage of Lycophron's *Cassandra* (vss. 1397-1408), where Midas, on his expedition against Thrace, puts on donkey's ears,<sup>44</sup> i.e., as-

<sup>32</sup> Ovid *Metam.* vi. 383 ff.; *Myth. Vat.* i. 125. The motif of springs from tears is widespread, and not only in antiquity. Cf. Parthenius *Περὶ ἑρπυλίων παθημάτων* xi. 3; Apollon. *Rhod.* i. 388 and 1063; schol. i. 974, 1063, 1065, 1068; schol. Nicand. *Theriaca* 958; *Alexiph.* 11; Paus. ii. 3. 2; E. Bethe, *Thebanische Heldenlieder* (Leipzig, 1891), p. 120; Paul Sébillot, *Le Folklore de France* (Paris, 1904-7), II, 175; J. Bédier, *Les Légendes épiques* (Paris, 1921), IV, 52; S. Thompson, *Motif-Index*, A 941. 2; D 1567. 2.

<sup>33</sup> Steph. Byz., s.v. Περσινόος.

<sup>34</sup> Diod. Sic. iii. 58 f.

<sup>35</sup> A. B. Cook, *JHS*, XIV (1894), 81 ff.; H. Reich, *Neue Jahrbücher f. d. kl. Altertum*, XIII (1904), 708; O. Schroeder, *Archiv. f. Religionswissenschaft*, VIII (1905), 76 ff.; E. Kuhnert, in Roscher, *Lex.*, IV, col. 457; O. Kern, *Die Religion der Griechen*, I (Berlin, 1926), 19.

<sup>36</sup> Reinach, *op. cit.*, IV, 38. On the donkey as the ordinary mount of the Sileni and Satyrs cf. also Cook, *JHS*, XIV, 91.

<sup>37</sup> Ap. Athen. ii. 45C.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. also H. Lewy, *Rheinisches Museum*, XLVIII (1893), 411.

<sup>39</sup> On Midas cf. Cook, *JHS*, XIV, 87.

<sup>40</sup> *Myth. Vat.* i. 90; ii. 116; iii. 10. 7; Fulgent. iii. 9.

<sup>41</sup> Eustath. *ad Dionys. Perieg.* 321.

<sup>42</sup> Philostr. *Vita Apollon.* vi. 27. 2.

<sup>43</sup> E. Kuhnert, in Roscher, *Lex.*, II (2), col. 2960 ff.; A. B. Cook, *Zeus*, II (1925), 969 f.

<sup>44</sup> For a different interpretation of this passage cf., however, the edition of G. R. Mair (in "Loeb Classical Library" [1921]), p. 611.

simulates himself to the ass-shaped god of his people.

The Phrygians, as is well known, were newcomers in Asia Minor: their original home had been Macedonia, where Herodotus (viii. 138) mentions the wonderful rose gardens of Midas, situated at the foot of Mount Bermion, close to the spring called *Inna* ("the Mule"). Whether Midas was thought to pasture on these roses is not stated; but one is reminded of the dénouement of Apuleius' *Golden Ass*, where the hero, transformed into a donkey, must eat roses to recover his human shape. Since the subject of this novel is known to be of Balkan origin, it is fair to infer that the author or authors are likely to have known the rose gardens of Midas; they were doubtless also familiar with the widely spread tale of the donkey's ears of the old Phrygian king. So they introduced the feature that, to recover his pristine shape, the hero must adopt the diet of Midas.<sup>45</sup>

From these data one fact would seem to be reasonably certain: The Phrygians worshiped, in ancient times, a divinity imaged in the form of an ass. We are not told what animals were sacrificed to him; but the myth of his death, preserved in the tradition current about Marsyas and the well-known observation that the former animal shape of a god or goddess is frequently indicated by his or her favorite sacrificial animal would make it plausible that, like the Hyperborean Apollon of Pindar, this Anatolian deity rejoiced in the sacrifice of donkeys.

In the myth, it is true, Marsyas is himself sacrificed—by Apollon and, as it were, to Apollon. This, in turn, would lead us to infer the existence of an ass-shaped Apollon, that is, it would bring us back to such

figures as 'Απόλλων Κιλλαῖος and 'Απόλλων Πριαπαῖος, both equally of Anatolian origin. In other words, Anatolia, in addition to a "mouse Apollon,"<sup>46</sup> also knew an "ass Apollon."

It is inadvisable to attribute excessive weight to the notice of Clement of Alexandria,<sup>47</sup> according to which the Arcadians believed their Apollon Nomios a son of Silenus. But the tradition may very well point to an ancient animal form of the god. Of greater significance is the *rapprochement* of Marsyas with the Thracian Maron (Μάρων). Whatever one may think of Welcker's hypothesis, which assumed a relationship between his name and that of Marsyas,<sup>48</sup> it cannot be doubted that Maron is a Thracian Silenus, the patron divinity of the cities of Ismaros and Maroneia. According to the *Odyssey* (ix. 197 ff.), he was a priest of Apollon and appears to have been, originally, horse-shaped: the coins of Maroneia still show a running horse. If we recall that the horse is relatively a latecomer (of which more anon), the successor of the humble ass, the conclusion may seem warranted that this Thracian Silenus, too, was originally a donkey. If it is further remembered that the assimilation of priests to their god is a common feature in the history of cults,<sup>49</sup> the fact that Maron is a priest of Apollon is perhaps no mere coincidence.

However this may be, we still have to account for the strange story of the contest of the two ass-gods and the slaughter of the one by the other. From the fact that

<sup>45</sup> Cf. my article in *CP*, XXXVI (1941), 133-41.

<sup>47</sup> *Protr.*, p. 24; cf. Sam Wide, *Lakonische Kulte* (Leipzig, 1893), p. 255.

<sup>48</sup> *Nachtr. zu der Schrift über die Aeschyl. Tril.* (Frankfurt a. M., 1826), p. 216.

<sup>49</sup> The reader will find excellent examples of this in A. Wiedemann, *Religion of the Ancient Egyptians* (London, 1897), p. 145; W. Robertson Smith, *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites* (London, 1923), p. 438; Sir James G. Frazer, *Anthologia anthropologica: The Native Races of America* (London, 1939), p. 185.

<sup>46</sup> On Midas as a donkey, ancestor of the old Phrygian kings, cf. also O. Keller, *Die antike Tierwelt*, I, 260.

in the myth of Marsyas' death the Satyr plays the flute and Apollon the lyre or cithara, some scholars have concluded that the tale merely reflects the opposition of the two instruments or of their partisans. Against this view it was pointed out that the story is unquestionably much older than the stage of civilization which such an interpretation would seem to postulate.<sup>50</sup> The true clue is furnished, I believe, by a variant of the tale preserved by Plutarch.<sup>51</sup> There the contest is divided into two acts: in the first, Apollon plays the cithara, Marsyas the flute, and the latter comes out victorious. In the second act Apollon accompanies his music with his song, a feat which Marsyas is obviously unable to imitate. So Apollon is declared victor, rather unfairly, it must be owned, and then proceeds to flay his unlucky rival. But the very unfairness of the proposition would tend to raise doubts about the originality of this feature; the very emphasis, however, which is laid on the vocal part of the contest, seems to be an ancient feature: it brings home the ill-fame of the donkey's bray.<sup>52</sup> The Greeks had a proverb: "Ονος λήρας άκούων, denoting a complete lout, and Suidas quotes the saying "Ονος πρὸς αὐλόν. In German the expression, "Er versteht davon so viel wie der Esel vom Harfenspiel," first given wider currency by Martin Luther, who thus characterized the theological knowledge of Thomas de Vio of Gaëta (in 1518), points in the same direction.<sup>53</sup> For an identical reason Aesop makes the ass judge the contest between cuckoo and nightingale, while more modern fables have the donkey enter a contest with the

nightingale itself.<sup>54</sup> In France one occasionally hears the donkey referred to as *rossignol d'Arcadie*. Now, Apollon being the god of harmony, the donkey's bray must have made Marsyas appear as the Hellenic god's natural antagonist.

This explanation, however plausible it may seem, fails to take into account—nay, is in contradiction with—Apollon's own asinine nature, which is certainly much older than the rules of harmony and 'Απόλλων Μουσηγέτης. So the real and primary cause of the antagonism of the two divinities must be sought elsewhere.

We have pointed out, above, the intrinsic impossibility of donkey sacrifices among the Hyperboreans of Hecataeus of Abdera: these Hyperboreans, frequently identified with the historical Celts, lived in a country in which donkeys are not found. But it is pertinent to ask whether an identification made at the time of Hecataeus and of Posidonius of Apamea is necessarily correct also for an older period, a question all the more justified because the term is much older than the time of Alexander the Great.<sup>55</sup> Here it is well to remember that geographic and ethnographic nomenclature is likely to be extremely elastic, filling its content with wider and even wholly different meanings as human knowledge advances. Thus the term "Indian" in the English language

<sup>50</sup> Cf., e.g., J. K. Schuller and Th. Steinhausen, *Aus der Walachei* (Hermannstadt, 1852), p. 3. One of the better-known variants of the theme is a little poem by Frederick of Prussia, contained in a letter to Voltaire under date of October 24, 1775:

"Un beau jour certain âne, en paissant dans les bois,  
Entendit préluder la tendre Philomèle,  
Qui célébrait l'amour dans la saison nouvelle.  
Admirateur jaloux des charmes de sa voix,  
L'âne ose imaginer de l'emporter sur elle;  
Sa voix rauque aussitôt se prépare à chanter  
(Tout, jusqu'à l'âne même, incline à se flatter),  
Mais comment réussit son désir téméraire?  
Tout s'envola d'abord quand il se mit à braire.

Petits auteurs, apprenez tous  
A demeurer dans votre sphère,  
Ou l'on se moquera de vous."

<sup>55</sup> Schroeder, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

<sup>51</sup> Reinach, *op. cit.*, IV, 32.

<sup>52</sup> *Quaest. conv.* vii. 8. 11; cf. *Myth. Vat.* ii. 115.

<sup>53</sup> On the connection of the donkey with music cf. Cook, *JHS*, XIV, 88 ff.

<sup>54</sup> For analogous proverbial sayings cf. E. Rolland, *Faune populaire de la France* (Paris, 1877-1915), IV, 230.

still reflects a time when Europeans (starting with Columbus) believed that the newly discovered American continent was a part of Asia. In this manner the term *Hyperboreioi* could have been applied to the Celts only after the Greeks had become somewhat familiar with the geography and ethnography of northern Gaul, which happened prior to Herodotus but after the founding of Massilia, about 600 B.C. Before that time the term doubtless denoted what the various etymologies of the word<sup>56</sup> would seem to indicate, some people or peoples living north of the Balkan range, regions such as present-day Bulgaria, Serbia, the Banat, etc.,<sup>57</sup> and in which the donkey is still one of the most important and most appreciated of domestic animals—a region, furthermore, from which the Phrygians are known to have invaded the great Anatolian peninsula.<sup>58</sup>

On this showing, the myth of the divine antagonism would become clear enough: both Apollon and Marsyas were divine donkeys, the latter worshiped by the indigenous Anatolian population, with a cult center at Kelainai, the former by a tribe of invaders hailing from southeastern Europe, which subjugated the natives and substituted their own divinity for that of the conquered. In other words, the victory of Apollon over Marsyas reflects the victory of the Apollon worshipers over the Marsyas worshipers.

If this view is to be accepted, two other conditions must be fulfilled, to wit: (1) there must be evidence of Apollon's northern origin and (2) Marsyas must be shown to belong to a more ancient stratum of population.

<sup>56</sup> *RE*, XVII, 258 ff.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. G. H. Macurdy, *Class. Rev.*, XXX (1916), 180–83; S. Casson, *Class. Rev.*, XXXIV (1920), 1–3 (less convincing); Schroeder, *op. cit.*, VIII, 69–84.

<sup>58</sup> Paul Kretschmer, *Einführung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache* (Göttingen, 1896), pp. 172 ff.

The writer believes that evidence for the migration of the Apollon cult from the German North Sea coast through central Europe into the Balkans has been brought forward in a previous study of his.<sup>59</sup> Since the donkey was unknown in northern Germany, its association with the god can only have occurred farther south, in the lands of the Danube; and it is indeed likely that the original donkey-sacrificing Hyperboreans were some people settled in that region.

This conclusion, namely, that the original ass-sacrificing Hyperboreans are Danubians, receives a certain amount of corroboration from three sources. The Vergil commentator Servius (*ad Aen.* iv. 146) states: "Pictique Agathyrsi populi sunt Scythiae, colentes Apollinem hyperboreum cuius logia, *id est responsa*, feruntur." With this text should be compared a fragment of Apollodorus,<sup>60</sup> who mentions donkey sacrifices among the Scythians. Since the animal did not thrive in Scythia any more than it does in southern Russia today, it is likely that the donkey-sacrificing Scythians were the Agathyrsi, who were settled in what is today southern Rumania and Hungary. The second source, though late—in fact, medieval—cannot for this reason be altogether neglected. The oldest Bohemian chronicler, Cosmas of Prague (i. 11), in speaking of the heathen period of his native land, reports that donkey sacrifices were offered to the ancient gods by some Slavic tribe of northwestern Bohemia. On the one hand, it is difficult to discern the motive which could have induced the worthy canon to invent such a custom. On the other, if one considers the universal conservatism in matters religious, we may be dealing with a survival from a custom practiced by the pre-Slavonic inhabitants

<sup>59</sup> Cf. *CP*, XXXVII (1942), 353–70.

<sup>60</sup> *PHG*, I, 431.

of the Danubian basin. Finally, it appears that the words *όνος* and *asinus* have both been taken from a Thraco-Illyrian vocabulary.<sup>61</sup>

As for Marsyas, we shall see presently that his "territory" is by no means limited to Asia Minor. In the first place, the name *Μαρσύας* (var. *Μασσύας*), denoting springs and rivers, is also known in Syria,<sup>62</sup> where it was the name of a valley or region in Commagene.<sup>63</sup> Nor was it, in Asia Minor, limited to the domain of the Phrygians. Herodotus (v. 118 f.) knows of a Marsyas River in Caria;<sup>64</sup> and the *Masyes* or *Masses* River in Lydia<sup>65</sup> is but a variant of the *Marsyas*.<sup>66</sup>

At all events, it is clear that the name of Marsyas is not Phrygian but belongs to a stratum of Anatolian populations which was not confined to Phrygia, or even to Asia Minor, but encroached on northern Syria. Thus Sir William Ramsay<sup>67</sup> was evidently right in thinking that the name belongs to the tongue of a pre-Phrygian people, and he suggested the Hittites.<sup>68</sup>

However this may be, it is significant that in Palestine, as in Phrygia, the donkey is connected with springs. Thus Ananias, son of Zibbeon, finds hot springs in the desert while pasturing his father's donkeys.<sup>69</sup> When Samson drops the donkey's jaw with which he had slain a thousand Philistines, a spring gushes forth.<sup>70</sup> Plu-

tarch,<sup>71</sup> drawing apparently on some compiler contemporary with Antiochus Epiphanes, sought to explain the alleged Jewish worship of the ass (of which more anon) by saying that the Jews honor the donkey for having shown them a spring of water. Tacitus<sup>72</sup> corroborates the same tradition: "Nihil aeque [Iudaeos in deserto] quam inopia aquae fatigabat, iamque haud procul exitio totis campis procubuerant, cum grex asinorum agrestium e pastu in rupem nemore opacam concessit. Secutus Moyses coniectura herbidi soli largas aquarum venas aperit . . . effigiem animalis, quo monstrante errorem sitimque depulerant, penetrali sacravere."

Among the Thraco-Phrygians, both in Europe and in Asia Minor, Midas, the legendary ancestor of the old Phrygian dynasty, whose original ass-shape was pointed out above, was a *Quellgeist*, as is clearly seen from the *πηγή Μίδα*<sup>73</sup> and the *Μίδου κρήνη*.<sup>74</sup> One may go even further and say that the Sileni as a group are intimately connected with springs.<sup>75</sup> Thus in the Laconian town of Pyrrhichos, Silenus was said to have caused a spring to gush forth in the market place.<sup>76</sup>

The relation between the donkey and water is thus fairly well established. As for the reasons which are adduced by various scholars to explain this connection and which may be found summarized in Professor Cook's essay,<sup>77</sup> they are more than dubious. It seems certain that the legends just reviewed cannot very well be

<sup>61</sup> E. Boisacq, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (1938), s.v. *όνος*; cf. also Walde-Hofmann, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (1938), s.v. "asinus."

<sup>62</sup> Pliny *NH* v. 81; Polyb. v. 45. 8-10; 61. 7; Strabo xvi. 2. 11; 18-20.

<sup>63</sup> Pliny *op. cit.* v. 86.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. also Ramsay, *op. cit.*, I, 348.

<sup>65</sup> Xanth. *Lydiak.*, in *FHG*, IV, 629.

<sup>66</sup> Plutarch *De mus.* 7. <sup>67</sup> *Op. cit.*, I, 348.

<sup>68</sup> The word *Μαρσύας* seems to be connected with Gr. *μάριπος* (Lat. *marsupium*, meaning "leather bag"), Av. *maršu*, "belly" (cf. C. D. Buck, *JF*, XXV, 257). I owe this reference to my friend and colleague, Professor Giuliano Bonfante, of Princeton University.

<sup>69</sup> Gen. 36:24.

<sup>70</sup> Judg. 15:15-20.

<sup>71</sup> *Symp.* iv. 5; *Quaest. conviv.* v. 2. 10.

<sup>72</sup> *Hist.* v. 3-4 (ed. Fisher); cf. Tertullian *Apologet.* 16.

<sup>73</sup> E. Kuhnert, in Roscher, *Lex.*, II (2), cols. 2960 f.

<sup>74</sup> Xenoph. *Anab.* i. 2. 13.

<sup>75</sup> Kuhnert, in Roscher, *Lex.*, IV, 511 and 516; Kretschmer, *op. cit.*, p. 199.

<sup>76</sup> Paus. iii. 25. 3.

<sup>77</sup> *JHS*, XIV, 98.



separated from analogous traditions localized elsewhere, in which the animal producing springs with its hoofs is not a donkey but a horse. The most famous of these is probably the story of Pegasus (from *πηγή*, "spring") and Hippokrene;<sup>78</sup> but similar traditions are widely current also in northern Europe.<sup>79</sup> It would seem obvious that all these tales, whether the hero be a donkey or a horse, must find their explanation in one and the same fact or set of facts. In the opinion of the writer, we are dealing with the ability of animals to sense the proximity of water, a matter of common knowledge in North Africa as well as in the Near and Middle East, where the camel is known to have this sort of supersense.

Whether or no the Hittites introduced the cult of an ass-shaped divinity from Anatolia into Syria, it is a fact that there are many traces of such a cult in Palestine. There is, first, the old clan name of *Hamor*, "jackass," localized in Sichem. Then there is the age-old fable, the darling of the anti-Semites of antiquity, to the effect that the Jews worshiped a donkey in the Temple of Jerusalem.<sup>80</sup> Such

stories, however absurd, are rarely made up out of whole cloth but generally reflect some solid fact, however distorted or misunderstood. In this case the donkey worship was presumably peculiar to some Canaanitish tribe or tribes subjugated or displaced by the invading Hebrews. The well-known tradition about the contention of two of Jacob's sons with the people of Sichem<sup>81</sup> would seem to corroborate this conjecture. Then there is the curious injunction: "But the firstling of an ass thou shalt redeem with a lamb: and if thou redeem him not, then shalt thou break his neck."<sup>82</sup>

This is as much as to say that, while the first-born of other domestic animals, such as bulls and sheep, are to be sacrificed to Jahveh, the ass is not acceptable as an offering: a lamb must be offered, instead, or else the ass destroyed. This may mean that the ass was simply an "unclean" animal (Lev. 11:7) and as such not acceptable as a sacrifice; but it may also mean that the animal was obnoxious to Jahveh because it was sacred to some rival deity of whom Jahveh was "jealous."

This conjecture receives a certain amount of confirmation from the fact that the wild ass was eaten by the Arabs with a religious intention, since its flesh was forbidden to Christian converts by St. Simeon Stylites, while among the Harareans it was forbidden food, like the swine and the dog.<sup>83</sup>

The data collected<sup>84</sup> will be found to

<sup>78</sup> Cf. O. Gruppe, *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte* (Munich, 1906), I, 132 and 191; H. Steuding, *Griechische und römische Mythologie* (Berlin-Leipzig, 1913), p. 44; W. R. Halliday, *Greek Divination* (London, 1913), p. 118; Reinach, *op. cit.*, VI, 241 and 250 f.; Wilde, *op. cit.*, p. 180.

<sup>79</sup> O. Henne-am Rhyn, *Die deutsche Volksage* (Leipzig, 1874), p. 524; A. Kuhn, *Sagen, Gebräuche und Märchen aus Westfalen* (Leipzig, 1859), I, 256, No. 294; A. Kuhn and F. L. W. Schwartz, *Norddeutsche Sagen, Märchen und Gebräuche* (Leipzig, 1848), p. 246, No. 273; F. Panzer, *Bayerische Sagen und Gebräuche* (Munich, 1848-55), I, 291; E. H. Meyer, *Mythologie der Germanen* (Strasbourg, 1903), p. 386; J. Grimm, *Kleinere Schriften* (1864-84), II, 450; J. W. Wolf, *Niederländische Sagen* (Leipzig, 1843), p. 28, No. 19; P. W. Joyce, *Old Celtic Romances* (London, 1898), p. 99; cf. Thompson, *op. cit.*, A 941. 1. The same motif is found in Vedic India: L. Myrland, *Die Akrins oder arischen Dioskuren* (Munich, 1876), p. 152; and in Russia: A. Rambaud, *La Russie épique* (Paris, 1876), p. 105.

<sup>80</sup> Cf. Reinach, *op. cit.*, I, 342 ff.; G. Boissier, *Tacite* (Paris, 1904), p. 77.

<sup>81</sup> Genesis, chap. 34.

<sup>82</sup> Exod. 34:20; cf. also F. C. Movers, *Die Phönizier* (Bonn, 1841-56), I, 366.

<sup>83</sup> Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 468.

<sup>84</sup> We have omitted all references to the role of the divine ass in Egypt, where a new feature makes its appearance: the evil (demonic) character of the animal (cf. A. Wiedemann, *Herodots zweites Buch mit sachlichen Erläuterungen* [Leipzig, 1890], p. 451; A. H. Sayce, *The Egypt of the Hebrews and Herodotos* [London, 1902], p. 136).



confirm rather strikingly the jibe of Robert Browning's *Aristophanes' Apology*:

"The gods?

What and where are they?" What my sire supposed,

And where yon cloud conceals them! "Till they 'scape

And scramble down to Leda, as a swan,

Europa, as a bull! why not as—ass

To somebody?"

True enough, no myth has come down in which a high god in the form of an ass seduced a fair one, though it cannot, of course, be gainsaid that such a myth may have existed and, for all we know, may have been quite as popular as the famous story of Leda and the divine swan. At all events, the Phrygian tradition of the ass-shaped Midas, ancestor of a royal dynasty, would make this almost certain.

What did most effectively prevent the cultivation of such myths in classical Greece is—there can be little doubt—the all-important fact that the fortunes of the modest donkey went down in the world after the days when that world was young, and the reasons for this adversity are not far to seek.<sup>85</sup>

The horse, as is well known, is a comparative newcomer in the domestic economy of the Near and the Middle East, where it appears to have been introduced, by invaders from the North, in the course of the second millennium of the pre-Christian era.<sup>86</sup> Its introduction brought on a revolution comparable only to the one we have witnessed in the present century as a result of the invention of the motorcar. Before the coming of the horse, the most important draft animal and beast of bur-

den was the donkey.<sup>87</sup> However odd it may seem to us today, it even played the role of race horse and war steed. A few examples must suffice to make this clear.

In Vedic India (where the horse does not thrive because of the tropical climate) the ass was the mount of the Asvins or Aryan Dioscuri, to whom the animal was sacred.<sup>88</sup> Donkeys draw the chariot of the Twin Gods when they make their appearance in the morning twilight,<sup>89</sup> and with such a team they win a chariot race.<sup>90</sup>

At the time of Absalom's ill-starred rebellion, David's warriors were still mounted on mules, not on horses.<sup>91</sup> After his defeat Absalom sought safety in flight mounted on a mule,<sup>92</sup> sure proof that horses were as yet too rare and hence too expensive even for a king's son. When David sent Solomon to Gihon to be anointed, he had him mount on his own, David's, mule.<sup>93</sup>

Nor was the part played by the donkey in war altogether negligible. When Darius attacked the Scythians, his contingent of asses proved most effective in routing the enemy's cavalry.<sup>94</sup> According to Eratosthenes,<sup>95</sup> in the great battle of the gods against the Giants, the Satyrs are mounted on asses, whose braying frightens the enemy and wins the battle. Pausanias (x. 18. 4) states that the Ambrakiots dedicated a bronze ass in gratitude for a night victory over the Molossians, in which the foe had been routed by a timely bray. Again it is difficult to see how the sound of

<sup>87</sup> Ebert, *op. cit.*, III, 122 f.

<sup>88</sup> *Rig-Veda* I. 34. 9; viii. 74 (85). 7.

<sup>89</sup> Myrtilanthus, *op. cit.*, pp. 74 and 103.

<sup>90</sup> *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, iv. 2. 9.

<sup>91</sup> II Sam. 13:29.

<sup>92</sup> II Sam. 18:9.

<sup>93</sup> I Kings 1:33.

<sup>94</sup> Herod. iv. 129.

<sup>95</sup> *Catast.* xl, p. 246 (ed. West).

<sup>85</sup> On what follows cf. also the excellent account of Ch. Renel, *L'Évolution d'un mythe: Asvins et Dioscures* (Paris, 1896), pp. 99 ff.

<sup>86</sup> A. Köster, "Die Herkunft des Pferdes in Babylonien," in *Festschrift zu F. C. Lehmann-Haupt's 60. Geburtstag* (Wien-Leipzig, 1921), pp. 158 ff.; B. Meissner, in Ebert's *Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte*, X, 114.

Marsyas' flute could have frightened the Galatae, as Pausanias (x. 30. 9) reports; but the braying of donkeys may well have terrified the Galatian cavalry. In the *Rig-Veda* (i. 29. 5) the ass likewise throws the enemy into confusion by its discordant voice. According to Aelian,<sup>96</sup> the Sarakoi, a (probably) Iranian tribe, used donkeys as steeds in war and dedicated to Ares such specimens as were distinguished by a particularly loud bray. Much the same thing is reported by Strabo (xv. 2. 14) of the Carmanians; and he adds that the use of donkeys in war is due to the absence of horses, a statement unquestionably correct, since horses do not thrive in the hot climate of that region (Gedrosia), and that asses are sacrificed by them to Ares, their god of war. Indra himself has a swift-footed donkey, and one of the epithets of Vikramaditya was *Gardhar bhā-rūpa*, "he in the form of an ass."<sup>97</sup>

The coming of the horse completely changed this state of things. The donkey was relegated to a subordinate position. In the *Iliad* (xi. 558 ff.) he already appears as a symbol of stolidity and obstinacy. Again, while the horse soon came to be the mount of the proud conqueror (cf. Alexander's Bucephalus), the donkey logically assumed the role of the meek and peaceful animal par excellence, the mount

of the Messiah,<sup>98</sup> of saints and of priests. Thus in the Syriac *Acta Thomae*, St. Thomas, the twin brother of the Lord, tames a team of four wild asses.<sup>99</sup> The saints Cantius, Cantianus, and Cantianella are described leaving Aquileia in a cart drawn by mules, which, in a flight of fancy, the martyrologist compares with Elijah's chariot of fire.<sup>100</sup> In the twelfth century, Pope Alexander III, one of the most imperious of pontiffs, would ride on a donkey, in studied contrast to the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa and his retinue, mounted on steeds.<sup>101</sup>

Thus it will appear that a god in the shape of an ass was far from incongruous in the second millennium of the pre-Christian era—no more incongruous, in fact, than a Zeus in bull-shape or the Scandinavian Frey in the form of a stallion, and an 'Απόλλων "Όρος is no more ridiculous than an 'Απόλλων Σμυνθείς or an 'Απόλλων Κύκνος.

Mutantur tempora. . . .

PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

<sup>96</sup> This process was an accomplished fact by the time that the well-known messianic prophecy (Zech. 9:9-10) was written, that is, probably, the third century B.C. (cf. *The New Schaff-Hersog Encyclopedia*, XII, 500 f.).

<sup>99</sup> J. Rendel Harris, *The Dioscuri in the Christian Legends* (London, 1903), p. 26.

<sup>100</sup> Harris, *The Cult of the Heavenly Twins* (Cambridge, 1906), p. 68.

<sup>101</sup> I should like to acknowledge, in concluding, the generous help of Professor Giuliano Bonfante, who has kindly gone over the manuscript and corrected a number of inaccuracies.

<sup>96</sup> *De nat. anim.* xii. 34.

<sup>97</sup> W. Crooke, *The Popular Religion and Folk-Lore of Northern India* (Westminster, 1896), II, 208.

## JULIAN DATES AND GREEK CALENDARS

W. KENDRICK PRITCHETT

IN 1939, Professor W. B. Dinsmoor published an article titled "Archaeology and Astronomy,"<sup>1</sup> which, taken in conjunction with his several earlier articles and his two volumes on Athenian archons, contains virtually complete tables for equating Julian dates with days in the Athenian civil calendar throughout the five centuries from Solon to 100 B.C. and, at the same time, an explanation of the divergences between dates preserved in terms of the Athenian calendar and of the calendars of other Greek city-states. Dinsmoor's article is primarily concerned with the theory of temple-orientation, whereby it is argued that the axes of ancient temples were laid out along the direction of sunrise on the morning of certain religious holidays. For example, the temple known as the Older Parthenon would be dedicated presumably at the Panathenaic Festival on the twenty-eighth day of the first Athenian month. Since the axes of ancient temples are known from archeological evidence, the exact year of the dedication can be determined by calculation and by observation of the direction of sunrise, provided that Julian dates for the festivals can be established.

Dinsmoor's method of obtaining Julian dates involves the construction of schematic lunar calendars, astronomically more or less correct for Athens and incorrect for other city-states. He adopts assumptions which have been accepted in unbroken tradition from the publication of Scaliger's *De emendatione temporum* in 1583 through the recent investigations of

Beloch, Meritt, and Dinsmoor. Elsewhere it has been suggested that a different interpretation of the large mass of Athenian epigraphical material in the period after 432 B.C. is desirable.<sup>2</sup> It is my intent here to continue this investigation by examining the evidence for dates preserved in terms of the Athenian calendar and of some other local calendar and by a study of the history of the particular schematic lunar calendar which has come to be associated with the Athenian civil calendar.

Various schematic calendars mentioned by Geminus of Rhodes, who wrote his *Εισαγωγή εἰς τὰ φαινόμενα* in the first century B.C.,<sup>3</sup> are attributed by Dinsmoor as shown in Table 1.

At the introduction of chapter 8 (6), Geminus makes it clear that he is referring to cycles developed by astronomers: "Since neither the month nor the solar year consists of a whole number of days, a period of time was sought by astronomers, which should include whole numbers of days, of months, and of years." In turning, first, to the period of Marathon, it is necessary to study Dinsmoor's treatment of the passage in Geminus 8. 27-33. Here Geminus refers explicitly to an octaëteris of 2,922 days. Dinsmoor, realizing that successive eight-year cycles of 2,922 days would result in a calendar which gradually became out of step with the moon, assumed that this particular octaëteris of 2,922 days was in use from 566 to 558 B.C. only<sup>4</sup> and that in

<sup>2</sup> W. K. Pritchett and O. Neugebauer, *The Calendars of Athens* (Cambridge, Mass., 1947).

<sup>3</sup> Ed. K. Manitius (Leipzig, 1895).

<sup>4</sup> An unbroken sequence of octaëterides on the basis of this same passage of Geminus has been developed by E. Greswell, *Origines kalendariae Hellenicae*, I (Oxford, 1862), 341-61. He accepts both the state-

<sup>1</sup> *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, LXXX (1939), 95-173.

558 this cycle "by observation was found to be inadequate and was replaced successively by those of 2923 and 2924 days."<sup>5</sup>

Although one may waive considerations of the accuracy of local observations of the irregular lunar movement which permitted the discovery, after only eight years, of this calendric lag of approximately one day (99 lunations contain 2,923.53 days), it seems fair to conclude that Dinsmoor has, in effect, formulated hypothetical astronomical cycles which support the assumption that, on the day

would arrive at essentially the same result by assuming that the Athenians employed a calendric system in which the length of the months is determined by the actual phases of the moon. Each month of such a calendar begins on the evening when the new crescent becomes visible on the western horizon after a short period of invisibility of the moon.<sup>6</sup>

But the problem of determining Julian dates for the events in Greece during this period becomes complicated for Dinsmoor by the fact that, whereas he can assume that the Athenian civil calendar was

TABLE 1

Geminus Reference	Attributed by Geminus to:	Attributed by Dinsmoor to:	Dinsmoor Reference
8. 6 and 26. ....	οἱ ἀρχαῖοι	Athens: period of Solon	<i>Archons of Athens</i> , pp. 301-2*
8. 27-33. ....	(οἱ ἀρχαῖοι)	Athens: 566-432 B.C.	<i>Archons</i> , p. 303; cf. <i>PAPS</i> , LXXX (1939), 134, and <i>AJA</i> , XXXVIII (1934), 446-47
8. 50-56. ....	οἱ περὶ Εὐκτῆμονα καὶ Φίλιππον καὶ Κάλ- λιππον	Athens: after 432 B.C.	<i>Archons of Athens</i> , pp. 307 ff.
8. 36-39. ....	(οἱ ἀρχαῖοι)	Delos	<i>Ibid.</i> , pp. 307, 505

\* Dinsmoor (*The Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age* [Cambridge, 1931], p. 301) qualifies the connection of this system with Solon with the statement: "Perhaps Solon's system was the double year described" by Geminus.

in which the foundation of the Older Parthenon was laid, the Athenian civil calendar was astronomically correct. One

astronomically correct and, by consulting Ginzel's tables, can obtain a Julian date for Hekatombaion (I) 28 on which the axis of the temple of the Older Parthenon accords with the direction of sunrise,<sup>7</sup> no

ment of Plutarch that the battle of Marathon was fought on the sixth of Boedromion and the conclusion inferable from Herodotus that the battle was on the day of the full moon. This discrepancy from a true lunar calendar Greswell then explains by assuming that eight-year cycles, all of 2,922 days, had been employed by the Athenians since a very early period. It is fruitless here to examine the various means which modern scholars have used to determine the epoch of their cycles, although this is a problem of major importance for all who adopt schematic calendars.

<sup>5</sup> Indeed, Dinsmoor, after positing eight-year cycles in which "the months were probably hollow and full in unbroken alternation," contradicts his entire schematic calendar by stating (*AJA*, XXXVIII [1934], 442, n. 3): "The corresponding first day of the Attic month is here tentatively assumed to have begun, not at the time of the astronomical new moon (as I think was the case after Meton's reform; cf. *Archons of Athens*, pp. 313-15), but on the evening of the new light, when the crescent first became visible." A calendar based on observation would only occasionally agree with Dinsmoor's schematic calendar, although the difference would never be great.

<sup>6</sup> *AJA*, XXXVIII (1934), 446-47. Elsewhere, Dinsmoor (*Archons of Athens*, pp. 303, 305) speaks of this account of Geminus as "garbled" and "correct as to the general system, if not as regards the exact figures." Later (*PAPS*, LXXX [1939], 136), Dinsmoor abandons a cycle of 2,922 days for even the first octaëteris.

<sup>7</sup> If the Athenians in 558 B.C. formulated a schematic lunar calendar which, seventy years later, was exactly in accord with the moon, one may inquire what was the need for the so-called calendar "reforms" attributed by Dinsmoor to Meton and his successors.

such assumption will hold for the calendar at Olympia. The temple of Zeus at Olympia, according to the generally adopted interpretation of the archaeological evidence,<sup>8</sup> was started at the Olympic festival of 468 B.C. But the direction of sunrise on the day of the full moon (of the month Parthenios) does not accord with the axis of the temple; so Dinsmoor, in order to obtain a satisfactory date for the orientation of the temple, must assume that there was a discrepancy of eight days in the Olympian calendar from a true lunar calendar.<sup>9</sup> The evidence which Dinsmoor adduces to justify this discrepancy in the Olympian calendar consists of two examples from another "Dorian" state, Boeotia:

[1.] We are reminded of another discrepancy of exactly seven days in another Dorian calendar of this period. Plutarch (*Aristeides*, 19) tells us that the Battle of Plataea in 479 B.C. occurred on Boedromion 4 according to the Athenians but on Panamos 26/27 (the fourth day from the end) according to the Boeotians; "concerning the discrepancy in the day one need not wonder, since even now many states vary as to the beginnings and ends of months."

[2.] How far the Boeotian Doric calendar could go astray is illustrated by a decree of the second century B.C. (*IG*, VII, 517), dated on the first day of one month by the civil year,

<sup>8</sup> So Dinsmoor, *PAPS*, LXXX (1939), 166.

<sup>9</sup> Dinsmoor states that the Olympic festival took place on Parthenios 14, which, according to his theory, must fall 8 days after the full moon in 468 B.C. But it is generally held that the date of this quadrennial festival was determined by the actual full moon, an arrangement which had the advantage that the date of the festival could be known without reference to any local calendar (see the *vetus Scholiast* on Pindar *Ol.* 3. 35: *δελφύμνιος: ἡ σελήνη, ἐπεὶ ἐν τῇ πανσελήνῳ δ' Ὀλυμπιακὸς ἀγὼν ἀγεται*; and on *Ol.* 10. 90: *τελεῖται γὰρ κατὰ πληροσέληνον . . . ἐν πανσελήνῳ γὰρ ἐρίθη δ' ἀγὼν*. Cf. also Tzetzes ad *Lycoph.* 40-43; and see, in addition, L. Weniger, *Klio*, V [1905], 1 ff.; L. Ziehen, *RE*, s.v. "Olympia," col. 3; and G. Thomson, *JHS*, LXIII [1943], 60). If this determination for the time of the festival is accepted, it is difficult to maintain Dinsmoor's theory of orientation for the temple of Zeus at Olympia.

but by the 16th day of the next month according to the astronomical year.<sup>10</sup>

In turn, the reason for the lunar accuracy of the Athenian calendar is stated by Dinsmoor as follows: "the Athenian [calendar] . . . would naturally be the more correct in view of closer relations with the Ionian astronomers."

If the Athenian calendar was determined by observation of the new crescent of the moon, as Dinsmoor posits in one place (see above, n. 6), what influence could Ionian astronomers exert which would make this observation more accurate? On the other hand, if we accept Dinsmoor's schematic calendar of octaëterides, we must ask what relations with Ionian astronomers did Athens have prior to 558 B.C. which resulted in the adoption in that year of a more or less perfect schematic calendar. Dinsmoor earlier explained his theory of a correction in 558 B.C. by saying that it was a result of local observations.<sup>11</sup> Yet he believes that at Olympia—and apparently in all "Doric" states—the civil administration had maintained for almost a century a calendar which was becoming increasingly out of step with the moon, without any effort at correction as a result of similar local observations.

The Boeotian inscription of the second century B.C. (*IG*, VII, 517), which Dinsmoor cites, contains the following double civil date: *μεινὸς Θουῖω νευμεινίη, κατὰ δὲ τὸν θεὸν Ὁμολωῖω ἑσκηδεκάτη*. Dinsmoor himself has made the far more numerous examples of double civil dates in Attic inscriptions the subject of lengthy investigation.<sup>12</sup> It is,

<sup>10</sup> The quotations are from Dinsmoor, *PAPS*, LXXX (1939), 166-67.

<sup>11</sup> *AJA*, XXXVIII (1934), 447.

<sup>12</sup> *Archons of Athens*, pp. 410-18; *The Athenian Archon List in the Light of Recent Discoveries* (New York, 1939), pp. 185, 216, 235-36, 239-42, 244-47. There are approximately seventeen examples of



therefore, not a little surprising that one Boeotian example of such a date is used to support an assumption that the Olympian calendar was astronomically incorrect and the Athenian correct.

For the date of the Battle of Plataea, Dinsmoor assumes that the "Dorian" calendar was astronomically inaccurate. It is not amiss, therefore, to examine the following ancient evidence which indicates a divergence between two local calendars in cases where both obviously cannot be astronomically correct, as well as evidence which indicates discrepancy of a civil calendar with the moon.

1. *At Sparta before the Battle of Marathon*.—Herodotus states (vi. 106) that, after Pheidippides had rendered to Athens the reply of the Lacedaemonians with which he was charged, τοῖσι δὲ ἔαδε μὲν βοηθεῖν Ἀθηναίοισι, ἀδύνατα δὲ σφί ἦν τὸ παραυτίκα ποιεῖν ταῦτα, οὐ βουλομένοισι λυεῖν τὸν νόμον· ἦν γὰρ ἱσταμένου τοῦ μηνὸς εἰνάτη, εἰνάτη δὲ οὐκ ἐξελεύσεσθαι ἔφασαν μὴ οὐ πλήρους ἔοντος τοῦ κύκλου. After which Herodotus adds: οὗτοι μὲν νυν τὴν πανσέληνον ἔμενον. The phrase which refers to the calendar may be translated, "and they would make no expedition, they said, on the ninth day unless the moon is full." This, however, is a translation which exegetes of this passage, with their preconceptions of a perfect lunar calendar, have consistently rejected. For example, How and Wells<sup>13</sup> state: "μὴ οὐ might mean 'unless the moon be full that day' (cf. ch. 9. 1); but that a full moon should fall on the ninth of the month would imply a grossly disordered calendar." For Dinsmoor's schematic "Dorian" calendar, on the other hand, it would be just at this

period that the full moon would be falling regularly about the ninth.

2. *Battle of Marathon*.—Thrice does Plutarch fix a definite date for the battle, Boedromion 6.<sup>14</sup> That the Athenians celebrated the event on this date is also attested.<sup>15</sup> On the other hand, the account of the battle in Herodotus connects the battle with the full of the moon.<sup>16</sup> One must readily admit that the festive day in honor of an event need not be the calendric anniversary. Nevertheless, those who adopt the date of Boedromion 6 have one advantage: it is not necessary to assume that Plutarch (or his sources) was in error.

3. *Battle of Plataea*.—The only authority who has recorded the date of the battle is Plutarch; in the life of *Aristeides* 19, he writes (Loeb translation):

This battle was fought on the fourth of the month Boedromion, as the Athenians reckon time; but according to the Boeotian calendar, on the twenty-seventh of the month Panemus, the day when, down to the present time, the Hellenic council assembles in Plataea, and the Plataeans sacrifice to Zeus the Deliverer for the victory. We must not wonder at the apparent discrepancy between these dates, since, even now that astronomy is a more exact science, different peoples have different beginnings and endings for their months.<sup>17</sup>

4. *Thucydides*.—There are two calendar equations preserved in Thucydides in terms of the Athenian and Spartan calendars. The ancient historian (v. 19) explicitly gives the following equation for the date of the Peace of Nicias in 422/1

<sup>14</sup> *De malig.* 26 (= *Moralia* 861 E); *Camillus* 19; *De glor. Ath.* 7 (= *Moralia* 349 F).

<sup>15</sup> See A. Mommsen, *Feste der Stadt Athen* (Leipzig, 1898), pp. 175-78; cf. L. Deubner, *Attische Feste* (Berlin, 1932), p. 209. In critical analysis of calendric matters, it may be noted that Mommsen's *Feste* has not been supplanted by the more recent work of Deubner.

<sup>16</sup> vi. 106 and 120.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Plutarch *Camillus* 19. 3; *De glor. Ath.* 7 (Boedromion 3).

double civil dates preserved in Attic inscriptions (for a study of these dates see Pritchett and Neugebauer, *op. cit.*, pp. 14-23).

<sup>13</sup> *Commentary on Herodotus*, II (Oxford, 1912), 108.

B.C.: Elaphebolion (IX) 25 = Artemisios 27. Two years earlier, in 424/3, Thucydides (iv. 118-19) says that the Truce of Brasidas was sanctioned by the Athenians on Elaphebolion (IX) 14 and sworn to by the Spartans on Gerastios 12. It is not explicitly clear that these dates are identical. But, assuming that those scholars who do believe so are correct—they include almost all modern students of the calendar with the exception of A. Mommsen—we find that the date of the month at Athens in 423 B.C. was two days lower, but in 421 B.C. two days higher.

It is interesting to examine how scholars who believe in schematic calendars explain this divergence of four days. I reproduce the sequences of hollow and full months in the solution offered by Boeckh<sup>18</sup> and Schmidt:<sup>19</sup> Athens (Elaphebolion to Elaphebolion, inclusive): 30 30 29 30 30 29 30 29 30 30 29 30 29 30 29 30 30 29 30. Sparta: 29 30 etc. (alternating). The schematic arrangement of months in the calendar assigned to Athens is not attested in the calendric or astronomical literature.

Turning to the more recent schematic calendars of Dinsmoor<sup>20</sup> and Meritt,<sup>21</sup> we have for Athens the following sequence of months: 30 29 30 29 30 29 30 29 30 29 30 29 30 29 30 29 30 29 30 29 30. If we are to assume that Sparta, too, was operating with a rigid schematic calendar, this calendar in which the total of 29-day months would exceed that of the 30-day months would be more out of relation to the lunar movement than any of the schematic calendars in the astronomical literature. In addition, it may be

noted that this Spartan calendar for the period 423-421 B.C. would be inferior astronomically to the calendar which Dinsmoor hypothesized for the "Dorian" states fifty and one hundred years earlier and by means of which he obtained a date for the laying-out of the axis of the Temple of Zeus at Olympia.

E. Cavaignac,<sup>22</sup> in a recent study of these two equations, has adopted hypotheses which are diametrically opposed to those of Dinsmoor: the Athenian calendar was a schematic calendar with months alternating between 29 and 30 days; the Spartan calendar was determined by observation. Cavaignac offers no explanation for the extremely faulty observation of the lunar crescent which must in this case be assumed at Sparta. Whereas Dinsmoor assumes that it was the Athenians who would have the more astronomically correct calendar, Cavaignac states, "Étant donné le caractère des deux peuples, il est certain que c'étaient les Spartiates qui employaient le second procédé" (i.e., empirical observation).

5. *Aristoxenus*.—Next, we must turn to an important passage in Aristoxenus *Harmonica* ii. 37, which has frequently been ignored by students of the Greek calendar. Writing in the time of Theophrastus, Aristoxenus states:

Πέμπτον δ' ἐστὶ τῶν μερῶν τὸ περὶ τοὺς τόνους ἐφ' ὧν τιθέμενα τὰ συστήματα μελωδεῖται. Περὶ ὧν οὐδεὶς οὐδὲν εἴρηκεν, οὔτε τίνα τρόπον ληπτέον οὔτε πρὸς τί βλέποντας τὸν ἀριθμὸν αὐτῶν ἀποδοτέον ἐστίν. ἀλλὰ παντελῶς ἔοικε τῇ τῶν ἡμερῶν ἀγωγῇ τῶν ἀρμονικῶν ἢ περὶ τῶν τόνων ἀπὸδόσις, ὅλον ὅταν Κορίνθιοι μὲν δεκάτην ἀγῶσιν Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ πέμπτην ἕτεροι δὲ τινες ὀγδόην.

(Macran's translation: "The fifth part of our science deals with the keys in which the scales are placed for the purpose of melody. No explanation has yet been offered of the

<sup>18</sup> *Neue Jahrbücher für Paedagogik*, Suppl. I (1855), p. 91.

<sup>19</sup> *Handbuch der griechischen Chronologie* (Jena, 1889), p. 225.

<sup>20</sup> *Archons of Athens*, p. 424.

<sup>21</sup> *Athenian Financial Documents* (Ann Arbor, 1932), p. 178.

<sup>22</sup> *REG*, LVII (1944), 49-51.

manner in which those keys are to be found, or of the principle by which one must be guided in enunciating their number. The account of the keys given by the Harmonists closely resembles the observance of the days according to which, for example, the tenth day of the month at Corinth is the fifth at Athens, and the eighth somewhere else."<sup>23</sup>

There is no reason for presuming that in this case Aristoxenus either did not know what he was talking about or was purposefully perverting the fact.

6. *Themistocles*.—A letter (Themistocles *Ep.* vii),<sup>24</sup> apparently of the second century B.C.,<sup>25</sup> contains the following text: ἡκέ μοι τὰς ἐπιστολὰς παρὰ σοῦ κομίζων εἰς Ἐφεσον, ὡς μὲν Ἀθηναῖοι λογιζονται Βοηδρομιῶνος ἔτη καὶ νέα, ὡς δὲ ὑμεῖς, Πανήμου δεκάτῃ (ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἡ αὐτή). This letter was addressed to a Corinthian, and it is known that the month Boedromion at Athens corresponded to the month Panemos at Corinth.<sup>26</sup> The difference in the dates of the calendars at Athens and at Corinth, therefore, was either 20 or 10 days.<sup>27</sup>

On the basis of these examples, it is not amiss to draw the parallel of the problem which would confront the student of the medieval astronomical calendar if there were preserved only a few scattered double dates from the sixteenth century in terms of the calendars of German Catholic and Protestant states, with their divergence of 10 or 11 days. Also analogous, although the difference is one of convention and not of astronomy, are the

various "New Years" to be found in the calendars of medieval European states, including September 1, December 25, March 1, etc.<sup>28</sup> One can imagine the confusion which might have existed in these local civil calendars if the Roman calendar had not been universally adopted.

Before drawing any conclusions concerning the chaotic condition of Greek local civil calendars, it will be necessary to turn to the particular nineteen-year schematic calendar which Dinsmoor believes superseded at Athens his hypothetical octaëteric calendar. The passage in Geminus 8. 50–56, which presents a cycle of the astronomers in the school of Kallippos and his predecessors, is cited as the evidence. This gives a clear rule for the lengths of months, but no rule for the distribution of intercalary months. Reconstruction of this schematic calendar by various scholars who connect this with the Athenian civil calendar is given in Table 2. The numerals indicate the years in which intercalations are assumed to have been made.

The principle adopted by Scaliger for determining his arrangement of intercalary years was that Hekatombaion 1, the first day of the civil year, should be the new moon after the summer solstice. This is an idea—now disproved, I believe, by the epigraphical evidence—which is still frequently repeated in Athenian calendric studies.<sup>29</sup> Dodwell argued that the distribution of intercalary years for the first sixteen years of each cycle should be the same as in the two octaëteric cycles he had attributed to Solon. Böckh was the first to have before him sufficient epigraphical evidence to prove, as he believed, that the ordinary and intercalary years in the Athenian fifth-century civil

<sup>23</sup> H. S. Macran, *The Harmonics of Aristoxenus* (Oxford, 1902), p. 192.

<sup>24</sup> R. Hercher (ed.), *Epistolographi Graeci* (Paris, 1873), p. 746.

<sup>25</sup> See W. von Christ, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur*, p. 483.

<sup>26</sup> Philippus *Ep.* vi (Hercher, *op. cit.*, p. 466); cf. Bischoff, *RE*, s.v. "Kalender," col. 1592.

<sup>27</sup> E. Bickermann, *Chronologie*, p. 12 (Gercke-Norden, *Einleitung*, III, 5 [1933]), connects with these calendric divergences the Greek proverb *σαντὶ νομῆ-  
ναι κηρύσσει* (*Corpus paroemiographorum Graecorum*, Appen. II, No. 61); cf. Athen. viii, 349b.

<sup>28</sup> See H. Grotefend, *Zeitrechnung d. deutsch. Mittelalt.*, I (Hanover, 1891), 88.

<sup>29</sup> See, e.g., Thomson, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

calendar did not recur regularly in accord with any nineteen-year cycle. Therefore, the theory of the Metonic cycle for this period was logically rejected by Böckh, and he postulated that the cycle was not introduced until 330 B.C. With modification in the date of the introduction of the cycle, Böckh's position has been repeated by Mommsen, Schmidt, Sundwall, Unger, and Beloch. The Athenian archons were so

8. 50 ff., which refers to a schematic calendar created in the school of Euktemon, Philippos, and Kallippos, is to be retained as the authority for the Athenian civil calendar.<sup>31</sup> The governing principle of the position of intercalary years, however, is to be dismissed because "considerable liberty was allowed the *δημος*" in applying the schematic calendar.<sup>32</sup> Also to be dismissed are the rules prohibiting

TABLE 2

Author	Date	Publication	Order of Intercalary Years in Cycle
Scaliger.....	1583	<i>De emendatione temporum</i> , pp. 72 f.	2 5 8 10 13 16 18
Petavius.....	1627	<i>Doctrina temporum</i> , II, 13	3 6 8 11 14 17 19
Dodwell.....	1701	<i>De veteribus Graecorum Romanorumque cyclis</i> , Vol. I, secs. 33, 34	3 5 8 11 13 16 19
<i>Also accepted by:</i>			
Ideler.....	1825	<i>Handbuch</i> , I, 331	
Böckh.....	1855	<i>Neue Jahrbücher</i> , Suppl. I, p. 19	
A. Mommsen.....	1883	<i>Chronologie</i> , pp. 243 f.	3 6 9 11 14 17 19
A. Schmidt.....	1888	<i>Handbuch</i> , p. 439	2 5 8 11 14 16 18
Sundwall.....	1910	<i>Öfversigt af Finska Vetenskaps-Societätens Förhandlingar</i> , LII, Afd. B, No. 3, 20-21	3 6 9 12 15 17 19
Beloch.....	1927	<i>Gr. Gesch.</i> <sup>2</sup> , IV, Part II, 96-97	
Ferguson.....	1908	<i>Class. Phil.</i> , III, 386-93	Invoke a rule of "liberty" in the arrangement of intercalary years but retain the schematic sequence of full and hollow months
Meritt.....	1928	<i>Athenian Calendar</i>	
Dinsmoor.....	1931	<i>Archons of Athens</i>	

arranged by these scholars that they coincided with a fixed cycle of ordinary and intercalary years. This rule would doubtless still be the guiding principle in the arrangement of Athenian archons if Ferguson in 1898 had not announced the theory of tribal rotation of the secretaries—a theory which has been repeatedly confirmed by the numerous epigraphical discoveries in the excavations of the Athenian Agora.<sup>30</sup> The application of this theory shows that there is no fixed distribution of ordinary and intercalary years; but the scholars who have adopted the Ferguson theory have taken the following position: The passage in Geminus

the juxtaposition of two intercalary years<sup>33</sup> or the succession of three or more

<sup>31</sup> Such a schematic calendar would only occasionally agree with the irregular movement of the moon, nor does it have the advantage of starting every month with the new moon, as its advocates claim (see, e.g., Dinsmoor, *Archons of Athens*, p. 321, n. 5; and Meritt, *Athenian Financial Documents*, p. 150: "Meton's schedule gave the correct days for the new moon"; see also Pritchett and Neugebauer, *op. cit.*, pp. 11-14).

<sup>32</sup> Meritt, *Athenian Calendar*, p. 102. The inconsistency in the interpretation of Geminus becomes more pronounced, for example, when Dinsmoor (*Archons of Athens*, pp. 307, 505) argues that the archons at Delos, for whom the epigraphical evidence is limited, may be arranged in accordance with another schematic cycle in Geminus, those archons for whom years of 13 months are attested being assigned to intercalary years of the cycle, while for Athens, where the epigraphical evidence is abundant, a Geminus passage is adduced as the authority for the schematic calendar but the archons are placed without reference to intercalary or ordinary years.

<sup>33</sup> Meritt, *Athenian Calendar*, pp. 106, 115, 118; *Athenian Financial Documents*, pp. 109, 176.

<sup>30</sup> See, in particular, the able defense of this theory by Dinsmoor, *Athenian Archon List*, pp. 3 ff., and *AJA*, XLIX (1945), 610-12.

ordinary years.<sup>34</sup> Indeed, one rule—the only one difficult to check by epigraphical evidence—is to be retained from Geminus: the months are to alternate between 29 and 30 days, with the exception that there are to be two full months, spaced at regular intervals, in every fifteen.<sup>35</sup> Upon this rule has been pyramided the entire structure of recent investigations into the Athenian calendar.<sup>36</sup>

Geminus described his various schematic calendars in a chapter (8), entitled “Περὶ μηνῶν.” Standardized intercalations formed the basis of the various astronomical cycles, and the investigations of students of ancient astronomy have been directed toward a recovery and an evaluation of these rigid astronomical patterns. According to the arrangement of Athenian archons by Ferguson’s theory of tribal cycles, however, the actual civil calendar is shown to have lacked the rules for the

regular intercalations of months. There is no reason, therefore, to accept the minor rule for the regular distribution of days. As was stated in the *Calendars of Athens* (pp. 13–14), the strict regularity in the distribution of days according to an astronomically correct scheme makes no sense if one does not, at the same time, accept the major rules which guarantee regularity of the distribution of months. The position of Böckh and his followers may be considered logical in postulating that the cycle of Kallippos, as preserved in Geminus, might be applied to the Athenian civil calendar only in those periods wherein, according to the accepted interpretation of the epigraphical evidence of his day, there were standardized intercalations, but to be rejected for periods which lacked such intercalations.<sup>37</sup> With the announcement of Ferguson’s theory and the resulting rearrangement of ordinary and intercalary years, the evidence was then at hand to question the application to the Athenian civil calendar of the particular schematic calendar described in Geminus.

In conclusion, it seems reasonable to reject two postulates frequently made in Greek chronological studies:

1. That the first day of the month in any particular civil calendar is necessarily the day of the new moon or that the fourteenth or fifteenth is the day of the full moon.<sup>38</sup> Clearly, as seen in the

<sup>34</sup> Dinsmoor (*Athenian Archon List*, p. 14) writes: “We must admit a few exceptions resulting from disturbances or miscalculation, as in 425–421 (four years), 317–314 (three), 306–303 (three), 250–247 (three), 146–143 (three), and 134–131 (three years). There are also instances in which three ordinary years come together as the result of carelessness in placing two at the end and one at the beginning of the following cycle, or vice versa.”

<sup>35</sup> Another inconsistency in the use of the passage in Geminus 8. 50 ff. concerns the problem of exemptile days. Those scholars who quote this passage as the authority for their schematic calendar have argued at length concerning the day omitted in hollow months, without referring to Geminus’ explicit statement in the same paragraph that every sixty-fourth day was omitted in this particular calendar, irrespective of the position of that day in the month. Geminus states: “Accordingly after every 63 days it is necessary to eliminate a day in this cycle. And it is not always the 30th day that is to be eliminated, but the day that falls after an interval of 63 days is regarded as the day to be eliminated.” Scaliger (*op. cit.*, p. 78), Greswell (*Origines kalendariae Hellenicae*, I, 493 ff.), and J. K. Fotheringham (*Monthly Notices of R.A.S.*, March, 1924, p. 385) have recognized this very clearly; and Greswell has quoted in this connection the passages in Plutarch (*Sym.* Q. 9. 6 [= *Moralia* 741 B] and *De frat. am.* 18 [= *Moralia* 489 B]) on the omission of Boedromion 2 in the Athenian calendar. Reference to the day *δενίριας* Βοεδρομιῶνος is made in a fifth-century inscription (*IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 304, l. 55).

<sup>36</sup> See, e.g., Meritt, *Athenian Financial Documents*, pp. 177–79.

<sup>37</sup> It is to be noted, on the other hand, that in the case of Greek city-states, which evidence may prove to have adopted a nineteen-year cycle by the time of Diodorus (xii. 36), standardized intercalations must not be taken to imply necessarily a schematic calendar for the length of months. In other calendars in antiquity for which the so-called “Metonic” nineteen-year cycle is attested the beginning of the month was determined by the observation of the crescent (cf. R. A. Parker and W. H. Dubberstein, *Babylonian Chronology* [Chicago, 1942], pp. 1–4).

<sup>38</sup> Cf., e.g., Dinsmoor, *Archons of Athens*, p. 321, n. 5: “The month, however, had to agree with every new moon. Free variation on the part of the Athenians could only have led to confusion, and would hardly



passage of Aristoxenus quoted above, the divergence of five days in the civil calendars of two city-states located as near each other as Athens and Corinth is not an exceptional one. Only one of these, but not necessarily either, could accord with the moon.<sup>39</sup>

There is an important corollary: "We must reject the idea that we can recover exact Julian dates for a day in a civil calendar except (1) in the case of astronomical observations reported in terms of a local calendar; (2) dates in a calendar based on observation, designated in inscriptions by the phrase *κατὰ θεόν* ("according to the moon"), although here we must make allowance for local weather conditions; (3) dates in the Athenian prytany calendar which can be equated with the *κατὰ θεόν* calendar, if the hypothesis presented in the *Calendars of Athens* is accepted.<sup>40</sup>

have been tolerated"; and, for the Spartan calendar, see the quotation from How and Wells cited above, p. 238.

<sup>39</sup> The evidence for the chaotic condition of Greek civil calendars is not inconsonant with the theory presented in the *Calendars of Athens* (pp. 19-23) that local authorities exercised the right to tamper with the religious calendar. The important Euboean law published as *IG*, XII, 9, 207, expressly grants this authority to the officials of the four Euboean cities, in order to accommodate the movements of the theatrical troupe throughout Euboea. It may be suggested that, since *technitai* were organized, at least in the Hellenistic period, as a national trade-union and covered all Greece proper (see F. Poland, *Gesch. griech. Vereinwesens* [Leipzig, 1909], pp. 129-47, and *RE*, s.v. "technitai," cols. 2473 ff.), the appearance of these Dionysiac artists on the formal date of a festival may have been one of the causes of tampering with other religious calendars.

<sup>40</sup> In the fifth century, however, the date of the beginning of each prytany year cannot be determined; so I see no way at present to correlate the Julian calendar except as a rough approximation.

2. That we must limit our investigations into the nature of civil calendars to the schematic calendars in the astronomical literature.<sup>41</sup> The purpose of the cycles of Greek astronomers was to maintain for the mean month and the mean year their approximate astronomical value. The attested divergences between local civil calendars show that this purpose is not reflected therein.

Although Dinsmoor obtains a date astronomically correct at Athens and a date which is eight days off from the moon at Olympia, it seems unreasonable, on the one hand, to assume that the dissemination of astronomical information or local observation of the lunar movement was found in Athens and not in any "Doric" state or, on the other hand, to neglect the fact that one may, by postulating various epoch dates for various schematic cycles in the astronomical literature and invoking a rule of carelessness in the application of these cycles, arrive at many dates for the orientation of any Greek temple. In summary, we must admit that the calendric basis for the problem of temple-orientation is still so uncertain that one cannot consider the results obtained from the application of such a theory as reliable.

#### MUHLBERG COLLEGE

<sup>41</sup> Cf. the summation of the position of Meritt as given by A. B. West (*Class. Weekly*, XXIII [1929-30], 61): "For those who may consider the evidence insufficient to prove the adoption of the Metonic Cycle at this time (432 B.C.) Professor Meritt points out that the known intercalations are equally unsatisfactory for an eight-year cycle." Because an octaëteris was not employed is no reason to assume that a nineteen-year cycle was. For manifold types of lunar calendars historically attested, see the convenient summary of J. K. Fotheringham, *Nautical Almanac for 1931*, pp. 734-47 (add Herod. II. 4).

# BREAKS IN CONVERSATION AND THE TEXT OF PETRONIUS<sup>1</sup>

ELI E. BURRISS

THERE is one element in the critical treatment of the *Satyricon* which has been overlooked by scholars: they have failed to recognize breaks in conversation when modesty, fear, anger, or some other cause forces the speaker to stop in the midst of what he is saying. The result has been that scholars, because of their deadly serious attitude toward the art of emendation and from a lack of a sense of humor so necessary to a proper understanding of the *Satyricon*, have assumed that lacunae or corruptions exist at places where there are breaks due to one or another of the causes indicated above, have emended the supposed corruptions, and have filled in the supposed lacunae, often with ludicrous effects.

These breaks in conversation in the *Satyricon* divide themselves into three groups: (1) true instances of *aposiopesis*,<sup>2</sup> in which the speaker pauses, because of one of the reasons indicated above, and

then leaves it up to the imagination of the hearer to fill in the missing words; (2) quasi-*aposiopesis*,<sup>3</sup> when the speaker pauses because of some emotional disturbance and then, after he has gathered himself together, proceeds with what he was saying; and (3) breaks due to drunkenness.

It will be the purpose of this paper to discuss such breaks in their relation to the text of the *Satyricon* and to show that the text, where *aposiopesis* or some natural break in the conversation is apparent, is sound and that no emendation is necessary and nothing need be added.

## I. *aposiopesis*

Hermeros, a freedman friend of Trimalchio, in resentment at Ascyrtos' boisterous laughter, says (57. 6): *contubernalem meam redemi, ne quis in illius—manus tergeret* ("I ransomed my slave-wife so that no one would wipe his hands on her—"). This is one of the commonest types of *aposiopesis*, in which modesty, real or affected, makes the speaker reluctant to say what he has in mind. Not realizing the possibility of *aposiopesis* at this point, scholars have suggested various innocuous words to fill in the supposed lacuna after *illius*, e.g., *sinu* (Heinsius); *capite* (Reines); *villis* (Scheffer); *capillis* (Kaibel).

Seleucus comments on the fact that Chrysanthus' wife was rather niggardly with her tears at her husband's funeral and then goes on to say (47. 7): *Quid si non illam optime accepisset? Sed mulier*

<sup>1</sup> For the text of illustrative passages from the *Cena* I have used Stephen Gaselee's collotype reproduction of the Codex Traguriensis (Cambridge, 1915). Any deviation from the text of H will be indicated at the proper place. For passages taken from other parts of the *Satyricon*, I have based my text on the readings collected by Charles Beck in his *The Manuscripts of the Satyricon of Petronius Arbitr* (Cambridge, Mass., 1863), and on the apparatus of Franciscus Buecheler in his *Petronii Arbitri Satirarum reliquiae* (Berlin, 1862), and of Alfred Ernout in his *Pétron* (Paris, 1931). The latter must be used with caution because of the large number of typographical errors which it contains. The exegetical notes of Hadriandides, Burman, Buecheler, Friedländer, and Paratore have been consulted to find out whether editors have discovered instances of *aposiopesis* and conversational breaks. The results have been negative.

<sup>2</sup> For the subject of *aposiopesis* in general see J. B. Hofmann, *Lateinische Umgangssprache*<sup>2</sup> (Leipzig, 1923), pp. 53 ff.; and Cicero *De orat.* III. 53. 205; also Quintilian ix. 2. 54–57; ix. 1. 31. Instances of *aposiopesis* will be found in Vergil *Aen.* I. 135; *Ecl.* 3. 7–9; Ovid *Epist.* 20. 51; *Her.* 13. 164; Plautus *Pers.* 296; *Pseud.* 1178 (Goetz-Schoell).

<sup>3</sup> Quintilian ix. 2. 57 recognizes quasi-*aposiopesis*: *est alia non quidem reticentia, quae sit imperfecti sermonis, sed tamen praecisa velut ante legitimum finem oratio. . . .*

*quae—mulier milvinum genus* ("What if he hadn't treated her well? But a woman who—hang it! a woman's a kind of buzzard"). *Mulier quae mulier* of H has been retained by editors in the sense "a woman who is a real woman." Some scholars, however, puzzled by these words, have suggested emendations, e.g., Reiske, who suggested *mulier qua mulier* ("a woman in so far as she is a woman"). The difficulty vanishes if we assume a pause after *quae*. This *aposiopesis* was first recognized by Scheffer.

Niceros explains his interest in Melissa as follows (61. 7): *Sed ego non mehercules corporaliter eam aut [autem, aut H] propter res venerias curavi, sed magis quod—bene moriar!—fuit—* ("But I didn't care for her in a physical sense, or sexually, but rather because, as I hope to die honorably, she was—"). The pause after *fuit* is natural in the context, because Niceros really did care for Melissa in a physical way; but after expressing the wish *bene moriar!* he hesitates, for he cannot, on the spur of the moment, think of any virtue Melissa may possess other than physical attractiveness.

The *aposiopesis* after *fuit* obviates the necessity of accepting the emendation *benemoria* (Orelli) or *bene morata* (Hadrianides), one or the other of which has been accepted by editors.

Ganymedes prattles on about the high cost of living and blames the commissioners of markets in these words (44. 3): *Aediles—male eveniat!—qui cum pistoribus colludunt—* ("The market commissioners—damn 'em!—who are in cahoots with the bakers, why they—"). There is no necessity here to remove what appears, at first blush, to be a solecism by emending to *aedilibus male eveniat* (Patavina) or to *aediles male pereant* (Jacobs). The hearer, familiar as he is with the misdoings of the commissioners, can readily complete the

thought broken off at *colludunt*. On the other hand, *male eveniat* with the accusative has been defended by analogy with *male dicere* with the accusative (J. B. Hofmann, *Gnomon*, IV [1928], 508). Otherwise, *aediles* has no grammatical construction and is the logical, not the grammatical, object.

Trimalchio complains about rumblings in his stomach (47. 2-3): *Ignoscite mihi inquit, amici, multis iam diebus venter mihi non respondit . . . spero tamen iam velerem [ventrem H] pudorem sibi imponet [imponit H]. Alioquin circa stomachum mihi sonat, putes taurum—* ("Excuse me, my friends," said he, "for many days now my stomach has been out of kilter. . . . I hope, however, it'll observe its former proprieties before long. Besides, I have rumblings all around my stomach. You'd think a bull—"). The passage is much more effective with the pause after *taurum* than if we were to supply, even in thought, *mugire* (Tilebomen) or *esse* (Scheffer).

Trimalchio tells a story about some vampires which had snatched away the dead body of a favorite slave-boy of Trimalchio's former master (63. 4): *Cum ergo illum mater misella plangeret et nostrum [nos tum H] plures in tristimonio essemus, subito strigae coeperunt—putares canem leporem persequi* ("While, then, his poor mother was bemoaning his death and a number of us were sorrowing with her, the vampires suddenly began to—why, you'd have thought a hound was tracking down a hare"). H has a period after *coeperunt*, thus indicating a definite stop. Jacobs thought that something was missing after *coeperunt* and added *stridere*, which has been accepted by Ernout; Triller emended *coeperunt* of H to *crepuerunt*. Editors generally have taken *coeperunt* absolutely in the sense "started up," but the absolute use of an intransitive verb seems unparalleled in Petronius.

*Aposiopesis* appears after *imperant* in 58. 3 in the midst of Hermeros' tirade against Giton: *Bene nos habemus, at isti—pheuge!—qui tibi non imperant—* ("We're all right, but those good-for-nothings—phew!—who don't hold you in check, why they—"). The text of H is as follows: *bene nos habemus aut isti geuge qui tibi non imperant*, where Burman emended *aut* to *at* and Gurlitt emended *aut isti geuge* to *at isti? pheuge!* which I have accepted, omitting the question mark after *isti*. Other emendations are as follows: *agagae* or *agagulae* (Heinsius); *istic euge* (Buecheler in his first edition); *isti nugae* (Buecheler in subsequent editions). The latter emendation has been accepted by editors generally.

## II. QUASI-*aposiopesis*

In ordinary conversation people pause in the expression of their ideas or in telling a story, simply because they cannot, on the spur of the moment, put their thoughts into words, either because they become excited by what they are telling or for any one of a number of reasons involving the emotions. Petronius is an artist; and it seems unthinkable that he would neglect this opportunity to give the cachet of reality to the talk of his characters.

The following passages illustrate, as in the case of true *aposiopesis*, such pauses in the *Satyricon* and their effect on the text.

Ascyrtos starts to give Hermeros a tongue-lashing in retaliation for the latter's abuse, whereupon Trimalchio pleads with Hermeros to cease his wrangling (59. 2): *et tu cum esses capo—coco coco—atque cor non habebas* [*habeas* H] ("and when you were a young bantam—cluck cluck—and you too had no brains"). Trimalchio pretends to know something unsavory about Hermeros' past, hesitates to mention it, implies that he will do so un-

less the quarrel stops, and then gives an imitation of a young bantam hen clucking. H has a period after *coco coco*, thus indicating a stop at this point. Buecheler, in his first edition, felt that something had dropped out of the text after *coco coco* and suggested in his *apparatus* that *faciebas* or *sonabas* be supplied.

In 57. 8 Hermeros says to Ascyrtos: *Tu lacticulosus* [*laeticulosus* H]—*nec "mu" nec "ma" argutas* ("While you, mamma's darling,—you don't say 'boo' or 'baa' so that people can understand you"). Scheffer emended *laeticulosus* of H to *lacticulosus*, on the authority of the *glossae*, in which all editors have concurred. Buecheler, in his first edition, suspecting that something was missing after *lacticulosus*, added *es*. There seems, rather, to be a pause after *lacticulosus*, because of Hermeros' uncontrollable anger.

Niceros' story of the werewolf is one of the most exciting in the *Satyricon*. It would, therefore, be strange indeed if Petronius failed to represent Niceros pausing in excitement as he tells about his adventure. Emenders have shown slender imagination, in examining the text, not to realize this.

Niceros sets out at cockcrow in the moonlight for Melissa's farm, accompanied by a husky soldier whom he has asked to go with him as far as the fifth milestone. Niceros says (62. 3-4): *Venimus inter monumenta. Homo meus coepit ad stelas* [*stellas* H] *facere. Sed ego cantabundus—et stellas numero* ("We arrived among the tombs. My man set out for the grave-stones. But I, humming a tune—why, I also proceeded to count the stars"). *Sed ego* of H was emended to *sedeo ego* by Scheffer, which has been adopted by most editors. Other emendations are: *se, eo ego* (Müller); *sed ego eo* (Heinsius); *sed ego cantabundus stellas numero* [deleting *et*] (Rossbach). Niceros finds himself alone

among the tombstones, starts humming a tune, and then as he tells the story pauses after *cantabundus* for dramatic effect.

A break in the talk may possibly explain the difficulties in the text of 7. 2. Encolpius, in great excitement, tells about his meeting on the streets with an old woman who promises to conduct him to his lodgings: *Divinam ego putabam et—subinde, ut in locum secretiorem venimus, centonem anus urbana reiecit et "hic" inquit "debes habitare"* ("I thought she was a witch and—presently, when we had reached a rather lonely spot, the obliging old woman flung back a ragged curtain and said, 'Here's where you ought to live'").

Encolpius pauses quite naturally after *et*: he has called the old woman a "witch," a word which brings to his mind some association which he is unwilling to divulge. Buecheler indicates a lacuna after *et*, and in his first edition suggested that *et subinde* be emended to *subsequi coepi*; Guhlmus emended to *et subsequor*; *inde*, both unnecessary, and both destroying some of the flavor of the original.

Again, in Trimalchio's story of the vampire-birds, we read (63. 5): *Habebamus tunc hominem Cappadocem, longum, valde audaculum, et qui valebat—poterat Iovem iratum tollere!* ("We had on our place at the time a Cappadocian, a tall fellow of great courage and one who even had the strength to—why, he actually could have lifted an angry Jupiter!"). *Poterat* has been deleted from the text by some editors as a gloss on *valebat*; but so simple a word as *valebat* should need no clarification. Trimalchio, as every reader of Petronius knows, is given to exaggeration: he comes to the word *valebat*, pauses a moment to conjure up some unusual feat which the doughty Cappadocian is capable of performing, and then says: *poterat Iovem iratum tollere*. H has a hair-

line in the same hand as the rest of the text. Reiske's emendation *bovem* for *iovem* of H has been accepted by Buecheler, Friedländer, Ernout, but not by Sage. If one keeps in mind Trimalchio's tendency to overdo everything and his extravagance in language, there is no need to emend to *bovem*. A little reflection at this point would have saved the emender from a rather silly blunder.

A slave of Agamemnon breaks in upon the adventurers, who are distraught by some harrowing experience the details of which are lost (26. 8-9): *Quid? vos inquit nescitis hodie apud quem fiat? Trimalchio, lautissimus homo—horologium in triclinio et bucinatorem habet subornatum, ut subinde sciatur quantum de vita perdidit* ("What!" he cried, "don't you know at whose house a dinner is being given today? At Trimalchio's, a most fashionable chap—why, he even has a clock in his dining-room and a trumpeter at hand, that he may know from time to time how much of his life he has lost"). Strelitz (*Jahrbücher für klassische Philologie*, CXIX [1879], 631) supposes that something has dropped out of the text after *homo*. Rather there is a dramatic pause on the part of the slave to impress his hearers with the elegance of his master's household.

Trimalchio dilates on the virtues of his estates and says (48. 2): *Deorum beneficio non emo, sed nunc quicquid ad salivam facit in suburbano nascitur—eo quod adhuc non novi* ("Thanks to Heaven's bounty, I never buy anything; but the fact is that whatever makes the mouth water is grown on an estate of mine near the city—the one with which I'm not yet acquainted"). In H, *eo* is separated from *nascitur* by a semicolon; and certainly a pause is called for here, because Trimalchio is pretending for the moment to have so many estates that he cannot recall the location of this



particular one. Goes emended *eo* of H to *meo*, realizing the awkwardness of *in suburbano nascitur eo*. It is neither necessary to emend the text nor to strain the Latin, for the pause after *nascitur* is natural.

### III. DRUNKENNESS

It seems incredible that in drunken scenes in the *Satyricon*, where there are breaks due to the mental and physical state of the characters, emenders should have gone to such ingenious lengths to make drunkards speak logically; but that is exactly what they have done, despite the fact that in the text as it stands many of the supposed corruptions and lacunae are merely Petronius' realistic way of indicating that his characters have lost control of their thinking and of their speech.

In a passage in which Trimalchio plumes himself on his culture he says, among other things (48. 4): *et ne me putes studia fastiditum, tres bibliothecas habeo, unam Graecam, alteram Latinam*—"and lest you imagine that I disdain book-learning, I have three libraries: one Greek, a second Latin—"). And then, since he cannot conjure up a third library, he pauses, abruptly changes the subject, and says to Agamemnon: *Dic ergo, si me amas, peristasim declamationis*. Emenders, not fully realizing that Trimalchio is "high,"

have tried to make sense out of the words. Tilebomen emended *tres* of H to *II*, which Buecheler and others have accepted; Scheffer proposed *alteras Latinas* for *alteram Latinam* of H.

In spite of the fact that Encolpius has revealed the drunken state of the banqueters when he says (64. 2): *sane iam lucernae mihi plures videbantur ardere totumque triclinium esse mutatum*, emenders have set to work in this chapter to fill in the supposed lacunae, which are really breaks a drunkard would normally make in his speech, and have made emendations *ad nauseam* to force Trimalchio's tipsy words to render sense. For example, in addressing Plocamus, Trimalchio says (64. 2): *Et solebas suavis esse, canturire belle diverbia* [*deverbia* H] *dicere* [*adocere* H] *melicam* ("and yet you used to be pleasant company, 'singing' dialogues and 'speaking' the lyric part"), which is just about what one would expect from Trimalchio in his cups. Because Trimalchio has used *suavius* in 61. 2, Buecheler emended *suavis* of H to *suavius*; and Scheffer, feeling that people do not ordinarily "sing dialogues" and "speak lyric parts," transposed the words as follows: *belle diverbia dicere, melica* [*melicam* H] *canturire*, which Buecheler followed.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

## NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

### FURTHER LIGHT ON THE "MYSTERY" INSCRIPTION IN CALIFORNIA

In 1944 I published<sup>1</sup> a five-line Latin verse inscription from a rub at the University of California, which had been made in Rome by C. R. Morey about August, 1902. The surface of the stone had evidently become somewhat flawed in the course of time, so that the reading of the text was unclear in two places. But I have recently received through Professor Morey two new squeezes from Professor B. Nogara, director of the Vatican Museum, which clarify the text beyond a doubt. The revised text is as follows:

Homo bonus infas adque amicus omnibus  
hie conquiescit anima superis tradita  
qui acceptum lumen mense XI reddidit  
Amymone ē matre ēq(ue) Marcello patre  
natus Quirina Athenodorus Roma domo.

Apart from the two doubtful readings,<sup>2</sup> there were several mysteries or difficulties about the inscription: briefly, (1) why it had never been scientifically published before—not published, in fact, since 1775 and hardly known since then; (2) where it had been from 1775 until 1902, when the rub was made by the young Mr. Morey, presumably in Rome; (3) what was the interpretation of the beginning of line 1; (4) what was the religious background (Christian? pagan?); and (5) why there were so many unique or rare points about it.

As many of these points as I could I cleared up, but I could not be fully sure of the text and I also made some errors of omission<sup>3</sup> and

commission,<sup>4</sup> which have been noted in reviews or in private letters, for which I am grateful.

A. M. Albareda, prefect of the Vatican Apostolic Library, informs me that the inscription is in the Galleria Lapidaria of the Vatican, and he incloses a letter from Angelo Silvagni, stating that Gaetano Marini (1742–1815) had included it in his big Christian epigraphical collection (having found it in the Museo Zeladiano<sup>5</sup>) and that G. B. De Rossi (1822–94) had also copied it, "noting that the indication of tribe in line 5, unparalleled in Christian epigraphy, excluded it from this category." Neither one published it, Marini simply because he never published his big collection at all, De Rossi presumably because he considered it non-Christian, though it would have made a good article for his *Bullettino di archeologia cristiana*. But why no one published it between 1775 and 1944, especially the editors of *CIL*, Vol. VI, I am still ignorant.

I agree with R. H. Barrow, of Oxford, that the first two words constitute "a substantive phrase in apposition with *Athenodorus*, or even virtually an adjective." But I find quite insufficient evidence for the claim for "a stereotyped *homobonus* of so many Christian grave inscriptions" made by another scholar. Of a total number of 39–41 examples of *homo bonus* or *Homobonus* that I can find down to ca. A.D. 600, only 11–15 are Christian, and they include 3–10 examples of the name *Homobonus*.

<sup>1</sup> *Univ. Calif. Pub. Class. Archaeol.*, I, No. 13, 313–56, Pls. 41–42.

<sup>2</sup> All my critics who mentioned the point were sure that the fifth letter of line 1 was *b*, not *f*.

<sup>3</sup> To my list of examples of the name *Homobonus* (p. 320) add four more: *CIL*, XII, 5686<sup>ms</sup> (?); XIII, 10010<sup>ms</sup>, 10024<sup>ms</sup> (a name or *homo bonef*?); XV, 7035 (a name or *omo bonef*). To the 30 examples of *homo bonus* (pp. 323 f., 351; No. 21 is a duplicate of No. 4, p. 320) add two more: *CIL*, III, 5811; IX, 2054. To the examples of *reddere* alone to mean "die" (p. 334) add Diehl, 1531.

<sup>4</sup> P. 351, l. 3, it should read "CIL VIII 381, 7362," etc. In l. 12 the right parenthesis belongs after, not "427," but "pagan." P. 355, n. 52, the name should be "Francis."

<sup>5</sup> This must have been the collection assembled by Cardinal Francesco Saverio de Zelada (1717–1801), about which the article on its owner in the *Enciclopedia italiana di scienze, lettere ed arti*, XXXV (Rome, 1937), 915, states that it included inscriptions *inter alia* and that the library portion later passed to the Vatican. It would appear now that the inscriptions did also.

The evidence indicates that *homo bonus* began as a somewhat stereotyped phrase of pagan tombstones and (naturally enough) continued in use among the early Christians, even developing into the proper name *Homobonus*.<sup>6</sup> But we cannot regard *homo bonus* in the present text as in itself proof of Christian origin, though my colleague, Ernst H. Kantorowicz, suggests that it may be the sign of a *crypto-Christian* text (on this, see below).

I like Werner Jaeger's explanation of the word order here: *Athenodorus homo bonus*, normal for prose, changed to allow postponement of the name to the last line (not unusual in epigraphical verse), without any thought that the nearness of *homo* and *infus* might ever cause difficulty. In my first paper I gave an example of a boy of three years termed *homo bonus*. In effect, therefore, *homo bonus* was probably felt as one word. Does it perhaps mean something other than "a good person"? To my colleague, I. M. Linforth, I owe an interesting parallel, which may indicate a development in the colloquial Latin hardly suggested by our written texts: the French *bonhomme*. In the eleventh-century *Life of Saint Alexis*, *bons om* is used condescendingly by an old man to his unrecognized son; in records of 1392 and 1478 *bon homme* clearly means both a condescending "my good man" (cf. English *goodman*) and a cuckold; and in present-day French *bonhomme* means "simple, good-natured."<sup>7</sup> "Good-natured" would do very well in our present text or simply "good." (I suppose that "good" used of an eleven-month-old baby is likely to mean no more than "good-natured.") As for the distinction between two words *homo bonus* and one word *homobonus*, it may partly be oral (the two words  $\text{e} \approx \text{o}$ , or like one word,  $\text{u} \approx \text{oo}$  ?), but perhaps only a written one; and, while the makers of Latin dictionaries have never recognized *homobonus*,

perhaps because the *homo*-element is always found inflected, the French have progressed from *bons om* through *bon homme* to *bonhomme* (note the plural *bonshommes*, with different pronunciation).

My big mistake previously was in respect to line 4 and *natus* of line 5. R. O. Fink (*CP*, XL, No. 4 [October, 1945], 251 f.) and Hermann Fränkel are undoubtedly right in correcting my line 4 from "Amymone est [or et?] matre et Quinto Marcello patre" to "Amymone ē matre ēque Marcello patre" (the lines over the two *e*'s being apices or signs of long vowels rather than marks of abbreviation) and in taking *natus* with line 4 instead of with line 5 (several correspondents made the latter point). This enables us to scan line 4 properly, giving *Amymone* its natural quantities:  $\text{u} \approx / - \approx / - \approx / - \approx / - \approx / - \approx /$ , and to avoid the awkwardness (and rarity) of the combination *natus Quirina*.

M. L. W. Laistner and B. L. Ullman questioned  $\tilde{\text{E}} = \text{et}$ . I quite agree. I have recently made a thorough study of abbreviation marks in Latin inscriptions and found not one sure case of  $\tilde{\text{E}}$  for *et*. (In fact, I have found very few examples of  $\tilde{\text{E}}$  for *est*: one of A.D. 525 [no longer extant], one of A.D. 571 [date ?], two in Christian texts of unknown date [one is of uncertain interpretation].)

There is no longer any point in looking for a *Quintus* Marcellus to father the child, and Fink rightly suggests the *Marcus* (no nomen or cognomen) who is the husband of one of the two or three other Amymones I have been able to find. Her date is not known, and the inscription is lost; but, of three seventeenth-century epigraphists who saw it, one dated the lettering as Hadrianic, the other two called it "magna pulcherrimaque." I should think that my date for the "mystery" inscription, ca. A.D. 200, might allow the identification of the two Amymones, especially since the name is so rare; but, of course, we cannot be sure.

For the scansion of line 1 Fink prefers

$\text{u} \approx / - \approx / - \approx / - \approx / - \approx /$

to my  $\text{u} \approx / - \approx /$ , etc., on the ground that the correct reading is *homo bonus*, not *Homobonus* or *homobonus* or *homofonus*. I agree that it is

<sup>6</sup> F. M. Heichelheim writes: "The name *Homobonus* is probably originally the Latin translation of a Hebrew and Aramaic name which survives up to our time in such names as Taub, Taube, Tauber, Daub, Daube, etc." I should rather call this a possible second source.

<sup>7</sup> I wish to acknowledge the help of my colleague, P. B. Fay, on the history of this word.

<sup>2</sup> Howard R. Patch, *The Goddess Fortuna in Medieval Literature* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927). The passage from Honorius Augustodunensis is cited on p. 64, n. 2, and on pp. 152-54, chiefly for its variations from Boethius' account of the wheel of fortune and without mention of other points discussed in this note.

mentioned in the latter work. Honorius Augustodunensis, in the Sermon for the eleventh Sunday after Pentecost in his *Speculum ecclesiae*,<sup>3</sup> on the text, "Beatus vir cui non imputabit Deus peccatum," first cited the familiar arguments for "spoiling the Egyptians" by extracting from pagan literature the gold, silver, gems, and clothing that they provide *ad utilitatem ecclesiae*: "sicut enim aurum per ferrum splendescit, sic sacra Scriptura per saeculares disciplinas fulgescit." He then applied the well-known case of the beautiful captive from a besieged city, whom her captor might legally marry after cutting her nails and hair, to the Christian warfare against heresy and vice:

Civitatem obsidemus dum aliquam haeresim vel errorem gentilium scriptis vel disputatione inpuamus. Puellam pulchram apud eos conspicimus, dum aliquam sententiam bene ab eis prolatam invenimus. Cui debemus ungues et crines praecidere et sic nobis conjungere, quia superflua et contra fidem posita debemus spernere; bene autem dicta et fidei nostrae non contraria ad instructionem fidelium libris nostris intexere.

The description of the wheel of fortune follows directly and is followed, in turn, by a reference to Ixion's wheel:

Scribunt itaque philosophi quod mulier rotae annexa jugiter circumferatur; cuius caput nunc in alta erigatur, nunc in ima demergatur. Rota haec quae volvitur est gloria huius mundi quae jugiter circumfertur. Mulier rotae innexa est fortuna gloriae intexta. Huius caput aliquando sursum, aliquando fertur deorsum, quia plerique multocius potentia et divitiis exaltantur, saepe egestate et miseriis exalliantur [*sic!*]. Dicunt etiam quod quidam apud inferos damnatus per radios rotae sit divaricatus; quae rota sine intermissione ab alto montis in ima vallis feratur et iterum alta repetens denuo relabatur.

<sup>3</sup> J.-P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. CLXXII, cols. 1056-60; the passages cited here occur in cols. 1056-57.

It is significant that Honorius chose the wheel of fortune as his first example of the use of the *bene dicta* of pagan philosophers for the edification of a Christian congregation; his association of the wheel with the unstable revolutions of worldly glory is also notable, for medieval writers most commonly chose classical anecdotes to illustrate their warnings against the fallacious glory of the world. His coupling of the wheel of Ixion with that of fortune is another indication that he thought of the latter as a classical symbol, not a medieval one.<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, as Dr. Patch pointed out, Honorius described Fortune as being rolled about on the wheel, not turning it herself, as she did in Boethius' description. This variant from the main classical tradition as illustrated by Dr. Robinson's citations from Ovid, Horace, and Pliny the Elder,<sup>5</sup> is in keeping with Honorius' moral purpose, whether it was derived from earlier writers or was his own innovation. While Honorius' version did not establish a regular literary tradition, it seems to have inspired a thirteenth-century stained-glass window in the Cathedral of Amiens, in which the figure of fortune is placed in the interior of the wheel and participates in its movement, instead of causing it.<sup>6</sup>

That Honorius considered the wheel of fortune as a classical *exemplum* for the Christian conflict against worldly vices is also demonstrated by the next portion of the sermon, with its transition from Ixion's punishment to those of Sisyphus and Prometheus and thence to the story of Medusa, the monstrous embodiment of the vice of luxury, destroyed by Perseus with the aid of his shield of crystalline virtues.

EVA MATTHEWS SANFORD

SWEET BRIAR COLLEGE

<sup>4</sup> Robinson (*op. cit.*, p. 210) mentions Ixion among the examples of the solar wheel but does not give any instances in which it is used with the wheel of fortune.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 212.

<sup>6</sup> Émile Mâle, *L'Art religieux du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle en France* (Paris, 1919), p. 119.



## MYTHOLOGY AND MYCOLOGY

The curious story told by Dion. Hal. *Ant.* iv. 2 and after him by Ov. *Fast.* vi. 627-34; Plin. *NH* xxxvi. 204; and Plut. *De fort. Rom.* 10. 323b-c, of Ocrisia, the mother of Servius Tullius, in the house of her captor Tarquinius,<sup>1</sup> impregnated by the strange form of a phallus which arose from the ashes of the hearth and remained for many days, has been analyzed, on its mythological side, by H. J. Rose,<sup>2</sup> who has separated it from another tradition in which the impregnating element of a spark from the hearth led to the birth of Caeculus, a reputed founder of Praeneste.<sup>3</sup> There seems, however, to have been little attempt to discover what physical fact lies back of the incident of Ocrisia, though most marvels and portents rest upon some phenomenon—geological, meteorological, astronomical, or biological, unusual in occurrence, not clearly understood, and hence explained as supernatural. One has but to think of such cases as the fire on the heads of Servius Tullius, Ascanius, and others

(St. Elmo's Fire),<sup>4</sup> significantly timed eclipses, supposedly portentous rains of blood and other substances, and the great host of Siamese twins and other forms of teratology to realize that back of each lies a more or less readily explicable natural cause. And in the Ocrisia legend, if we but assume that the hearth was of earth—an easy assumption for an Italic dwelling of the early period—it may be suggested that the strange form arising from it was the mushroom known to scientists as *Ithyphallus impudicus* (L.) Fr., a species of Europe, Asia, Africa, and the Americas, so uncanny in aspect<sup>5</sup> as easily to have suggested something supernatural and, though widely distributed, sufficiently unusual to make it remarkable rather than taken for granted. To anyone unfamiliar with its appearance there may be recommended the excellent and convincing plate in J. Bresadola, *Iconographia mycologica*, Vol. XXXIII (1932), Pl. MCXXXI, where its habitat is described as "ad terram, in silvis et locis silvaticis, nec non hortis; autumnno."

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

<sup>1</sup> Plut. *Rom.* 2. 3-5 applies the same tale to the daughter of Tarchetius, king of the Albans, and lays the scene in his house.

<sup>2</sup> *Mnemosyne*, LIII (1925), 410-13. I am indebted for this reference to Professor A. D. Nock.

<sup>3</sup> Serv. and Schol. *Veron. Aen.* vii. 678; Mart. *Cap.* vi. 642.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. J. G. Frazer, *Golden Bough*, II<sup>3</sup> (1917), 197 (193-99 deal with our story).

<sup>5</sup> Plut. *Rom.* 2. 3 calls it *φάσμα δαιμόνιον*.

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Les Lettres grecques en Occident: De Macrobe à Cassiodore.* By PIERRE COURCELLE. ("Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome," Fasc. 159.) Paris: De Boccard, 1943. Pp. xvi+440.

*An Introduction to Divine and Human Readings by Cassiodorus Senator.* Translated with an Introduction and Notes by LESLIE WEBBER JONES. ("Records of Civilization—Sources and Studies," Vol. XL.) New York: Columbia University Press, 1946. Pp. xvii+233. \$3.00.

Readers of the *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé* published in July of last year (new ser.; I, 8 ff.) will have studied with respectful admiration not untinged with deep emotion the report for the years 1940-45 presented by the secretary-general, M. A. Dain, to the general meeting of the association, held in December, 1945. In spite of dangers and hardships caused by the war and especially by the occupation of two-thirds of France by a ruthless enemy, research and publication in the field of classics and in other branches of humanistic study were not arrested; and the association can point with pride to a long list of books that appeared under its aegis during those difficult years. But other learned societies and organizations in France also carried on with vigor and determination. Thus several new volumes in the well-known series of monographs by members of the French schools at Rome and Athens were published. Among them is the remarkable book by M. Pierre Courcelle, whose excellent articles, published before the war on the sources of Boethius and on the site of Vivarium, had already proved him to be a scholar of the first rank. Courcelle defines his purpose as an investigation of the influence exercised during the fifth and sixth centuries by Greek authors on Latin writers who were either in the West or intended their works for Western readers; and he remarks (p. x) that the Romans had recourse in this age of decline to

Greek culture because what the Latin *grammaticus* and *rhétor* then had to offer was insufficient for their needs. Primarily, the book is concerned with four or five leading authors—Macrobius (pp. 3-36), Jerome (pp. 37-115), Augustine (pp. 137-209), Boethius (pp. 257-312), and Cassiodorus (pp. 313-41), but lesser writers within the period are not neglected.

The book is fully documented and teems with arresting judgments and challenging interpretations. The continued influence of Neo-Platonism in this epoch, and especially the attention paid to Porphyry, have long been familiar to students of the period. Courcelle sets out to show the extreme importance of the late fifth-century school at Alexandria and to demonstrate how much of Neo-Platonic thought, for instance, in Macrobius and even in Boethius, who had read considerably in the earlier Neo-Platonists, is directly derived from Ammonius' teaching and commentaries. He points out also that the revived interest in this philosophical school displayed in the circle of Claudianus Mamertus and Sidonius in Gaul coincides in point of time with the *floruit* of Proclus at Athens and the accession as emperor in the West of the Greek, Anthemius. He minimizes Jerome's knowledge of pagan Greek literature and even of the earlier Christian writers, when he sums up (p. 112): "Jérôme n'a rien lu de toute la littérature grecque chrétienne antérieure à Origène, sauf quelques œuvres de Clément de Rome et de Clément d'Alexandrie; il tient tout ce qu'il en sait d'auteurs intermédiaires. Sa culture est en réalité le fruit de ses séjours à Constantinople, Antioche, Alexandrie, Césarée." Jerome's profound debt to Origen is beyond question; nevertheless, Courcelle's thesis, in spite of its full documentation, does in the last analysis depend also on the *argumentum ex silentio*. Jerome's acquaintance with pagan Latin literature was wider than a mere list of authors named by him would suggest. In his letter to Laeta, for example, he silently adopts some of

the views on education of young children which had been put forward by Quintilian.

Of great interest is Courcelle's investigation of that much debated problem: How much Greek did Augustine know? He rightly insists that what was true of Augustine at one time of his life was not necessarily true at another. He argues, in my opinion convincingly, that down to 400 the African Father was virtually ignorant of Greek. But in the last decades of his life, largely because of the doctrinal controversies in which he became involved, he took up the study of Greek more seriously. Even so, Courcelle maintains, he never acquired a real mastery over the language and still relied as far as possible on Latin translations when such were available.

Perhaps the most impressive parts of this book are the chapters on Cassiodorus and on the subsequent influence in western Europe of his curriculum of monastic education and of his famous library. Courcelle demolishes for good Rudolf Beer's theory of *codices Vivarienses* migrating to Bobbio and Verona but, with justice, exposes the weakness of other theories that have been put forward about the later history of these manuscripts. He contends that paleographical data are not enough and that the only reasonably safe criterion for establishing the survival of a manuscript from Vivarium or of a copy of it is to be found in the contents—that is to say, when an existing codex contains the same works and even in the same order as a manuscript described by Cassiodorus in his *Institutiones*. The intermediate stage between Vivarium and the spread of Cassiodorian manuscripts to England and France in the eighth and ninth centuries was the Lateran in Rome. Much investigation is still needed, but at least Courcelle has blazed a new trail. Thanks to his labors a fresh start can be made, and he and others can inquire more fully and more readily into the many problems that still await solution. Indeed, in at least one instance, the author seems hardly aware of the full consequences that flow from one of his theories; for hitherto the only works of Cassiodorus known for certain to have reached England by the beginning of the eighth century were the commentary on

Psalms and the Latin version of Josephus. Both works were used by Bede, and, in the case of the commentary, there is the additional evidence of Durham MS B. II. 30, which E. A. Lowe assigns to the middle of the eighth century. Courcelle compares Cassiodorus' description of the commentaries on Genesis in his library (*Inst.* [ed. Mynors], pp. 11. 9–12. 27) with a passage in the letter prefatory to Bede's commentary on the same biblical book. He concludes: "Sachant que le fonds de Jarrow était issu du Latran, et possédant plusieurs manuscrits vivariens rapportés de Rome, [both statements are probable but not proved absolutely] est il téméraire de croire que Bède lisait au moins certaines de ces œuvres dans des manuscrits de Cassiodore ou dans leurs copies?" He also says categorically that Bede had read the *Institutiones*, and he would identify the *cosmographorum codex* brought back from Rome by Ceolfrid with the corpus of *cosmographi* in Cassiodorus' library. Of these three suggestions, the first is possible, although the correspondence between Cassiodorus' and Bede's descriptions of the commentators on Genesis does not strike me as being as close as Courcelle maintains that it is. The identification of the *cosmographorum codex* is scarcely possible; for Bede in another passage (*DTR* 35 [ed. C. W. Jones], 247. 40 and 370), where he is presumably referring to the same manuscript at Jarrow, makes it clear that his codex contained a calendar of some sort. Hitherto, owing to lack of satisfactory evidence, it has been assumed that no copy of the *Institutiones*, and particularly of Book i, was known to Bede or, indeed, reached England until a considerably later time. Attractive though Courcelle's theory is, it cannot be regarded as proved. It has only been possible to touch on some of the material presented in this notable book, which will repay the most careful study. In the past so many vague generalizations and statements unsupported by evidence concerning Greek studies and influence in western Europe during the fifth and sixth centuries have found their way into print that everyone must welcome this thorough and detailed investigation, even if the writer's conclusions may at times be too dogmatically stated.

An English version of the *Institutiones* has long been badly needed, and Jones has tackled a difficult task with courage. Comparison of various passages in his translation with Mynors' text shows that the rendering is essentially accurate and trustworthy.<sup>1</sup> He might perhaps have treated his author with more freedom. Cassiodorus' style has little merit, and there is no point in trying to reproduce it in English. Hence in some places the version would have been easier and more pleasant to read if the translator had broken up Cassiodorus' long periods into the shorter sentences characteristic of English. Still, Jones's translation is welcome and serviceable. It is the more to be regretted that the rest of the book has so many defects. The notes are inadequate. Mynors' purpose in his edition was to establish a reliable text from the best manuscripts; even so, he noted some of the references to other authors that Cassiodorus provides. These notes are reproduced by Jones, but his own additional notes are, for the most part, of an elementary character. Where comment was needed, it is often not given. Cassiodorus names works which are no longer extant; but there are others which survive and can be identified. A few examples must suffice: Jerome's interpretation (i. 2. 8 and 9) of the judgment of Solomon is in his letter to Rufinus (*Ep.* 74 [ed. Hilberg]), and his remarks to Vitalis about the sexual precocity of Solomon and Ahaz will be found in *Ep.* 72. Anthony's comment on Didymus the Blind (p. 84) needs a

note. Cassiodorus found this story in Socrates (*HE* iv. 19) and reproduced it in *Historia tripartita* viii. 8. Again, Cassiodorus was sometimes mistaken and hence misled later generations. There are two notable examples of this, but Jones says nothing about either. In i. 3. 3 Cassiodorus refers to Jerome's commentary on Jeremiah "in twenty books." This error troubled scholars in the ninth century, like Lupus and Hrabanus, who looked in vain for Books vii-xx, and persisted for centuries. There is no doubt that the extant Books i-vi are all that Jerome lived to compose. A full discussion of this matter will be found in Reiter's edition (*CSEL*, LIX, vi-x) of Jerome's commentary. The supposed letter of Jerome to Chromatius and Heliodorus (i. 32. 4), though accepted as genuine by Cassiodorus, is spurious. It is the letter that precedes the pseudo-Hieronymic martyrology (see Dom Quentin in *Acta sanctorum*, November, Vol. II, *pars posterior* [1931], p. 5). Why Cassiodorus turned Heliodorus into a lady is not clear. It is hard to see on what principle Jones proceeded in such notes as he does give. On page 95, for example, he rightly assigns Junilius a five-line note; but why did he not do the same for Adrian, Tyconius, and Eucherius, who are named in the same passage, instead of mentioning only the Latin titles of their works?

The Introduction provides a satisfactory treatment of Cassiodorus' life. Jones steers a judicious course between the older accounts and the extreme and not always trustworthy reconstructions of recent writers, like Van de Vyver. Section IV on "the fate of Vivarium and its books" is now of little use; for any treatment of this topic must now take into account of the work of Courcelle and also the masterly discussion of the Bobbio manuscripts by E. A. Lowe in *Codices Latini antiquiores*, IV (Clarendon Press, 1947), xx-xxvii. No blame, of course, attaches to Jones, since copies of Courcelle's book reached this country only toward the end of 1945 and he could not possibly have seen it in time. Section V, however, on Cassiodorus' influence in the Middle Ages could have been made far better than it is, even without Courcelle's help. Jones states that he has relied on

<sup>1</sup> A few minor points should be noted. On pp. 94-95 the phrase *Afer* or *Africanus antistes* is translated "bishop" or "prelate of Africa." To the student unfamiliar with the church organization of the Late Empire this might imply that Africa was a single see; "African bishop" is preferable. "Animosity" for *dolore* in i. 33. 2 misses the point. It is not the devil's animosity but the grief that he causes to mankind that is in question. To render *mortuo* (Pref. to li. 1) "laid low" is to destroy the antithesis in the Latin, *mundo peccatis mortuo aeternam vitam praestitit*. Here it would have been better to be quite literal. In li. 1. 1 *inculpabili* belongs to *peritia*; the translation should therefore not be "skill in finished speech and blameless writing" but "faultless skill in finished speech and writing." In li. 5. 9 *per auditum* is rendered "having the King listen" which is bad English as well as inaccurate. David brought Saul, "through his sense of hearing," health, "which doctors were unable to bring through the power of herbs." On p. 208, par. 8, "thou didst desire" must be "thou wert willing" (*voluisti*).

Becker's *Catalogi* and Lehmann's *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge*; he also leans heavily on Thiele's article and on Manitius' *Geschichte*. But why did he ignore the last-named's *HSS antiker Autoren in mittelalterlichen Bibliothekskatalogen*? There are, at all events, both errors and omissions. The two—not one—catalogues of the Lorsch library (pp. 53, 55, 57) were written, respectively, in the first half of the ninth century and a little later in the same century (see W. M. Lindsay, *Palaeographia Latina*, III [1924], 10, with Pls. I and II). The "unnamed English cloister" (pp. 56–57) was Peterborough, and its library owned a copy of *De anima* as well as the Latin Josephus and the *Historia tripartita* (see M. R. James in *Bibliographical Society Transactions*, Suppl. V [1926], pp. 27 and 35). The *De anima* was also at Passau by A.D. 903. The *Tripartite History* was at Lorsch and in an unknown French collection in the ninth century and at Wessobrunn in the eleventh. The library at Gorze in the eleventh century owned the commentary on Psalms and Book I of the *Institutiones*. The use of the commentary was more widespread than Thiele and Manitius and, following them, Jones, would lead one to suppose; for they take too little account of the purely theological literature of the earlier Middle Ages. Thus, to give but one instance, Bede used the commentary not merely in the *De schematibus et tropis* but in the almost equally early commentary on the Apocalypse; and he was still citing from it near the end of his life, when he composed the *Retraction* on Acts. On page 52, Jones observes that "Hugo of St Victor employs Cassiodorus' treatment of theology as a model for Books IV–VI of his *Didascalicon*." But Manitius (*Geschichte*, III, 114) to whom he refers in a note was by no means so positive and added the names of Jerome and Isidore. A glance through Brother Buttner's recent edition of the *Didascalicon* (Washington: Catholic University of America, 1939) suggests that Hugo in that part of his book relied mainly on Isidore, whom he quotes at length verbatim, and to a less extent on Jerome. Page 40, note 118: on the early use of the codex as distinct from the roll cf. C. C. McCown in *Harvard Theological Review*,

XXXIV (1941), 219–50. Page 202: so far from the *Tetrabiblos* having been "falsely attributed" to Ptolemy, it is now generally accepted as a genuine work by those best able to judge.

The number of errata in the Introduction and list of abbreviations is distressing; I have counted twenty-five in about fifty pages. Most of them occur in the titles of German works. The Index "has been prepared by a professional indexer supplied by the Columbia University Press." The results are not happy, but the chief blame must attach to Jones for not checking the Index properly in manuscript or in proof. Names and quotations that should be there have been omitted. In the Augustine entry the *Locutiones* are listed twice under different names, Dionysius the Abbot and Dionysius Exiguus, who are identical, are listed as two different persons. There is one entry for Epiphanius with eight references; some refer to Epiphanius of Cyprus, the rest to Epiphanius Scholasticus. Besides many entries under Cicero, we discover a single blushing violet under Tully! Ticonius the Donatist and Tyconius are separately indexed; and, last but not least, of two references under the single entry "Socrates," one refers to Plato's master, the other to the church historian! One must deplore that, while the translation itself is a commendable piece of work, the remainder of the book displays many signs of haste and slipshod method, which accord ill with the more careful scholarship shown by the author in his earlier publications.

M. L. W. LAISTNER

Cornell University

*The Theatre of Dionysus in Athens*. By A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1946. Pp. xvi+288+3 plans. \$7.50.

As the title suggests, this book treats of the Athenian theater in its material aspect, together with such appurtenances as the *ekkyklema*, *mechane*, and others said to have been employed at various times in the production of plays. With one exception, such topics as festivals, programs, actors, styles of acting, and the like have been excluded for treatment in a separate work. The exception is a brief section



(pp. 240-46) on "Theatrical Performances outside Athens from the Third Century B.C." Strictly, these few pages would seem to have their proper place in the second volume. Another small portion on certain theaters outside Athens (pp. 198-210) takes one away from the city but is nevertheless relevant to the subject. At any rate, one would be loath to part with the twelve illustrations accompanying these pages.

No one who has not followed in detail the literature of the subject since 1885 can fully appreciate the brilliant success achieved by the distinguished author of this book. Through endless controversies, often prejudiced and frequently acrimonious; through countless interpretations of evidence and alleged evidence; through theories both good and bad and some fantastically bad—the author has made his way with calm, unhurried tread, accepting here, explicitly rejecting there, again entirely suppressing. The result is the best account of the Dionysiac theater in Athens that has ever been published, with the exception of Fiechter's *Das Dionysos-Theater in Athen* (1935-36), which, however, while more basic in importance, is almost entirely archeological in character and is marred by several fanciful theories.

The style and treatment are very similar to those of the author's *Dithyramb, Tragedy, and Comedy*; the former terse, plain, at times almost severe; the latter characterized by a sober, unbiased, hard-hitting insistence upon validity of evidence, impatience with all "facile conjectures" (p. 180), and an emphasizing of those elements that partake most of "human interest" (pp. vii, 149). The product is a convincing presentation of fact and theory that will certainly hold the field until more and important evidence has been uncovered.

This book is, in a sense, a monument to the perspicacity and doughty stubbornness of Wilhelm Dörpfeld, whose epoch-making "no-stage theory," first announced in the winter of 1885-86 but not fully expounded until 1896, shook the classical world with the violence of a major earthquake. Until his death in 1940, Dörpfeld fought off all opponents—and won, won for the centuries that are of importance in

the history of Greek drama, that is, from the beginning to the Hellenistic period. Dörpfeld lost in his fight concerning the *proskenion*, and we who heard him in the spring of 1925 expound his theory of a stageless *Neronian* theater recognized that, as our author remarks (p. 257): "[his] passion for getting rid of the stage everywhere proved too much for him." The important point is that a conservative scholar, formerly an advocate of a stage, has written a book that denies the stage, whether high or low, to the Greek theater during the classical period, except possibly that at Epidaurus from the closing decades of the fourth century. The *proskenion*, which was a stage from the first (p. 175), was erected in the theater at Athens probably after 200 B.C. (p. 182), though earlier in some other places. Nothing is said about its origin except an indirect hint (p. 211) that it may have been introduced into Greece by way of Alexandria.

As for the earliest period, the author gently sets aside Bulle's theory of a long altar-like Thespian stage and Fiechter's equally fantastic assumption that there was a permanent stone background and stage building before 500 B.C. (p. 10) and, for the opening decades of the fifth century, Wilamowitz' *Chor-podium* (p. 34). Throughout the book many similarly unfortunate conjectures of different scholars are mentioned, only to be rejected. The worst offender appears to be Frickenhaus, whose treatise *Die allgriechische Bühne* (1917) was written in part in the trenches during World War I. It may be of interest to learn that when I talked in Athens in the spring of 1925 with Dr. Frickenhaus about his book, he told me that he had abandoned many of his views and was planning to prepare a drastically revised edition. Three months later he died.

There would be no point in picking out a score or more of inconsequential details in which the reviewer may differ from the author. Three or four matters, however, seem to invite comment. In the paragraph on the *Persians* (pp. 35 f.) one expects, but does not find, a reference to Harmon's "The Scene of the *Persians* of Aeschylus," *Trans. Amer. Philol. Assoc.*, Vol. LXIII (1932). More serious is the failure to mention, in the discussion of the

fifth-century scene-building, Broneer's stimulating paper, "The Tent of Xerxes and the Greek Theater," *Univ. Calif. Pub. in Class. Archaeol.* (1944). In the section on the Periclean theater (pp. 15 ff.) a simple statement at the outset that the *skene* cannot be reconstructed would be helpful. Helpful, too, a statement in connection with Figure 7 (p. 16) that the outline of the *skene* shown in that drawing is purely hypothetical, as is also the circle of the orchestra. There is no evidence that the orchestra in this theater was ever so marked (p. 146). On page 18 (cf. pp. 135, 267) reference is made to the double supporting walls and intervening buttresses on the west side of the auditorium, and the author states rightly, but without presenting the evidence in full, that the outer wall and buttresses are of later date than the inner wall. The fact is that the courses of the two walls and buttresses do not jibe. But this is nowhere stated (see Fiechter, *op. cit.*, I, 80, Fig. 69). There should perhaps be a photograph or sketch showing the discrepancy. Aside from the omission of two Greek accents (pp. 72, 241), the only misprints noticed have to do with measurements. On page 151 "about 5 ft. 3 in." should be "about 6 ft. 3 in." (cf. pp. 175, 268). On page 175 one reads that a *proskēnion* in stone was erected "at about 4 ft. 5 in. to the north of the *skene*." The actual distance is about 2 feet more than this.

Written by an eminent classical scholar who is noted for sound judgment and scrupulous regard for the truth and printed in accordance with the high standards of a famous press, this volume not only delights the eye but challenges the attention of every person interested in ancient Greek drama or the history of the theater.

JAMES T. ALLEN

*University of California*

---

*Studies on the History of Roman Sea-Power in Republican Times.* By J. H. THIEL. Amsterdam: North-Holland Pub. Co., 1946. Pp. vi+456.

This book is intended not as a general history of republican sea power, but as a necessary foundation for such a general history, yet

to be written. As the author notes, we have excellent analyses by Tarn and Kromayer for the naval operations of the First Punic War and of the first century B.C., but naval activity in the period 218-167 B.C. has been almost entirely neglected. The purpose of these studies is to fill the gap by a detailed discussion from the naval point of view of the Second Punic, Second Macedonian, Syrian, and Third Macedonian wars.

Within these limits Thiel has produced an admirable work. For each war he discusses, first, the political and military situation, the size of the fleets, their command, and their crews; then he analyzes our information on the naval operations year by year. Although this method involves some repetition and may frighten off the casual reader, it results in a thorough coverage of all pertinent events, and the author's vigorous style keeps the whole from being a mere assembly of facts. Incidentally, English-speaking readers must be grateful to Thiel for the decision to publish his studies in English rather than in Dutch; occasional slips in idiom and typographical errors reveal that his task was not always easy, but they are not sufficiently serious to mar the book.

Detailed criticism of his account year by year seems unnecessary, and indeed there is not much to criticize. Every page reveals a mastery of the relevant literature (down to 1940) and of the ancient sources as well; the examination of the validity of Livy for this period will need to be consulted by all editors and commentators on that author. Good judgment is also shown on the limitations and peculiarities of ancient naval warfare. The only serious slip I have noticed in this regard is the translation of *naves tectae* as "armoured vessels," which may mislead anyone not well acquainted with the ancient galley. In the promised general history of republican sea power it is to be hoped that the author will sketch operations on land more fully and will also buttress his view that Rome was engaged in conscious imperialism; further consideration may also assist in clearing up some of the puzzles of the Syrian War which remain incompletely resolved in this work.

The result of Thiel's studies is a remarkably clear picture of the value of sea power in the Second Punic War and also during the wars in the Aegean, especially the Second Macedonian War. Mahan, who felt strongly the significance of Roman mastery of the seas in the war against Hannibal but who also commented that we did not have "the full knowledge necessary for tracing in detail its influence upon the issue of the second Punic War," would have been surprised and pleased by this volume; though the ancient evidence is indeed spotty and woefully inadequate, it is combined skilfully to form a fairly connected story. At the same time, we have a clear picture of the reluctance of Rome to assume as strong a naval position as was desirable; in the Second Punic War, Rome calculated its fleets closely to meet enemy threats, real or imagined, and often was behind times in its naval preparations, especially in the war-weariness after 207. The saving factor throughout, as the author demonstrates, was the "remarkable paralysis of the Punic morale." In the Aegean wars the senate relied heavily upon its allies and escaped naval disaster several times only because of the ability of those allies. The story of command is that of the same reluctance to meet the problems of sea power squarely; the exigencies of the war against Hannibal forced the Romans to keep the same officials in command of fleets years on end and so to develop real admirals, but thereafter the old practice of annual offices quickly regained its stranglehold.

By way of explanation of the state of mind which could produce the expedients and half-measures that the Romans took on the sea, Thiel devotes his first chapter to a thoroughly sound treatment of the Romans' landlubberly qualities throughout their history. To my knowledge the point has never been put so well as in this chapter. As a tidbit, the last chapter is devoted to the mysterious *corvus* of the First Punic War, which helped the Romans win the battles of Mylae and Ecnomus. The opinion of Tarn that this instrument was simply a grappling iron is refuted, and the solution advanced is as simple as it is sound: after los-

ing two fleets in the storms of 255 and 253 the Romans realized that the boarding bridge reduced the seaworthiness of their quinqueremes and so abolished its use.

In conclusion, I cannot but refer to the conditions under which this book was written, i.e., in Holland during the bitter years of the German occupation. Although the author deprecatingly fears his work may bear "certain marks of unrest and lack of concentration," his fears do not seem justified; indeed, the volume is a noble proof of the vigor and constancy of modern scholarship. The general history of republican sea power which Thiel promises for the future will be eagerly awaited.

CHESTER G. STARR, JR.

University of Illinois

*Pauli Sententiae: A Palingenesia of the Opening Titles as a Specimen of Research in West Roman Vulgar Law.* By ERNST LEVY. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1945. Pp. xiii+131. \$2.75.

The justification for a review of a volume that has already received extensive treatment at the hands of a number of American scholars<sup>1</sup> must be afforded by the fact that the book deserves special attention by the readers of this periodical. *Pauli Sententiae* by Professor Levy merits such attention. In the first place, the *Sentences of Paul* is a work which holds a place of prime importance in the development of Roman law in the western portion of the Empire from the fourth to the sixth centuries A.D. It has been preserved down to our time through the medium of at least eight products of postclassical jurisprudence, chief among which is the *Lex Romana Visigothorum* (*Breviarium*). A critical commentary, passage by passage, of *Pauli Sententiae* has long been one of the most urgent needs of the student of Roman law. Professor Levy has given us a comprehensive commentary of about one-tenth of this work, presenting a brief explana-

<sup>1</sup> Hans Julius Wolff, in *Traditio*, III (1945), 412-16; Eberhard F. Bruck, *Harvard Law Review*, LIX (1945), 145-51; Max Radin, *American Journal of Philology*, LXVII (1946), 184-87.

tion of the meaning of each passage in its proper setting (in the paragraphs introduced by the letter *M*), of the classical or postclassical origin of the rule set forth (designated *O*), and of the significance of the doctrine in the evolution of the law (in the comment appended to the *Interpretatio Pauli* [*IP*] version of the text, when such exists). Thereby he has given us an excellent picture of a variety of legal institutions during a relatively obscure epoch of Roman history. The comments on *defensores*,<sup>2</sup> on *pactum* and *transactio*,<sup>3</sup> on *infames*,<sup>4</sup> on *procurator*,<sup>5</sup> and on *calumniator*,<sup>6</sup> to mention but a few, are of inestimable value to the student of late classical history and literature, as well as to the jurist.

An explanation of the content of *Pauli Sententiae* is not the sole concern of Professor Levy's book or, indeed, the one which holds the greatest interest for the classicist. In an earlier article<sup>7</sup> Levy has shown that the text of *Pauli Sententiae* consists of interwoven layers of material (as many as six different strata may be discerned), and his task herein has been to allocate to the separate authors their respective contributions. There is, first, he holds, the author (*A*) of the epitome of *Pauli Sententiae* composed shortly before A.D. 300;<sup>8</sup> next, the authors (*B*) of alterations to the text which were made between 300 and 450; then the authors (*C*) of alterations closely related to the *Interpretatio Pauli* mentioned above and made between 400 and 450; next the compilers (*V*) of the *Lex Romana Visigothorum* of 506; then the authors (*E*) of alterations made in the East prior to Justinian; and, finally, the compilers (*D*) of the *Digesta* of Justinian in 533. Professor Levy has subjected each passage to careful scrutiny and, by means of logical, historical, and philological criteria

(these and other tools are borrowed from extensive research into interpolations in the *Corpus iuris*<sup>9</sup>) has striven to assign the sentences, clauses, even words of *Pauli Sententiae* to their respective authors. Whether he is correct in every case or not, all are agreed that the work is a composite; and, until some attempt is made to reconstruct the component parts of *Pauli Sententiae* into a palinogenesia such as is done here, it is erroneous to utilize the source as affording an insight into the legal institutions of any given age. To the classicist the value is apparent. Levy's volume is a worthy example of a technique that can and should be applied to a score of source materials far from the legal field. The writings of the *grammatici veteres*, the *Scriptores historiae Augustae*, or the *Hermeneumata* appended to Dositheus<sup>10</sup> would seem to be typical of the type of classical work that would well reward the use of a similar approach.

There are thus two basic values to Professor Levy's work (as an extensive lexicon and as a worth-while technique) that are of immediate concern to the nonjurist and that will serve to magnify further the merit of an outstanding study in Roman legal history.

A. ARTHUR SCHILLER

Columbia University

*The Public Works of the Julio-Claudians and Flavians.* (A Dissertation Presented to the Faculty of Princeton University in Candidacy for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.) By FRANK CARD BOURNE. Princeton, 1946.

The primary purpose of a doctoral dissertation is to demonstrate the proficiency of the author as a research scholar in his chosen field. If the subject is well chosen, the dissertation will also explore and clarify a minor seg-

<sup>9</sup> Professor Radin's fulminations against interpolation study are too extreme; no one can today deny the value of such a study but may merely discount the efforts of extremists therein.

<sup>10</sup> The reviewer can vouch for the fact that this technique affords interesting results in his study of *Sententiae et epistulae Hadriani*, one part of the *Hermeneumata*.

<sup>2</sup> *PS* 1. 1a. 17, pp. 24 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* 1. 1. 1, pp. 43 ff.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* 1. 2. 1, pp. 66 ff.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* 1. 3. 2, pp. 78 ff.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* 1. 5. 2, pp. 107 ff.

<sup>7</sup> "Vulgarization of Roman Law in the Early Middle Ages," *Medievalia et humanistica*, I (1943), 14-40.

<sup>8</sup> Professors Berger, Volterra, and others, including the reviewer, would consider that the basic layer was the work of jurist Iulius Paulus himself; Levy contra.

ment of the area, which would otherwise fail to receive its due share of attention. The present work does both things and does them well. In his Foreword the author states two objectives which he hopes to attain: (1) to provide knowledge useful to the student of social, economic, and political history and (2) to furnish material for the study of the characters of great historical personages. The era of the Julio-Claudians and the Flavians is well adapted to this type of approach, for it presents to the student of history important problems of institutional development and a series of strongly individualized characters among the emperors. It has also bequeathed to us a larger amount of literary source material than any other period of Roman history, together with a great wealth of inscriptions and material remains. The author, however, warns his readers that, even for this high noontide of Rome's greatness, the data are too scanty to warrant him in claiming to have arrived at final conclusions. New discoveries may at any time supplement or modify his findings. Yet he has made full use of all the classes of source material at his disposal, and his bibliography of more than one hundred and fifty items seems quite full.

The book is divided into two parts. In a fifteen-page Introduction Dr. Bourne describes the public works policy of each emperor from Augustus to Domitian, shows how it is related to other phases of government, and discusses the personnel with which these works were executed. The last forty-four pages of the text are devoted to a minutely classified list of the public works of each emperor, with the location of each and a list of the sources from which knowledge of it may be gained. In so general a treatment one must not expect minute descriptions of individual works; and the author wisely confines himself to the more general aspects of his subject. An excellent system of cross-references enables him to use the second part of his book as documentation for his general discussion. Having thus buttressed every page of the latter with approximately three pages of documentation, Dr. Bourne appears to have given ample strength and solidity to his conclusions.

The whole work is marked by common sense, caution, and rational criticism. Novel and provocative conclusions are few and, when presented, are supported by copious evidence. It is generally admitted that the first century after Christ witnessed a slow decline in the privileged position of Rome and Italy, with a corresponding rise in the importance of the provinces. Dr. Bourne shows that this trend was reflected in the increased attention given by Claudius and the Flavians to provincial public works. But he takes issue with the traditional picture of Caligula as a prodigal spender of public funds, basing his opinion upon the small number of buildings which this emperor is known to have completed, upon his repossession of the funds stolen by road curators, and upon the fact that Claudius was able to undertake vast and grandiose projects immediately after his accession—thus presupposing that he found ample funds in the treasury. The discussion of roads and colonies, with the part played by them in the development of a coherent frontier policy, is excellent.

One point the author seems to have missed. In his discussion of the types of labor used by the emperors for the execution of public works, he mentions slaves, state prisoners, soldiers, and hired free laborers. This ignores entirely the drafting of provincial laborers (nominally free), although this system had always existed in Egypt and some other eastern provinces and was employed in the West at a very early date. Such were, in the opinion of this reviewer, the Britons, whose complaints Tacitus records in the *Agricola*. Had they been war captives, as Dr. Bourne suggests, they would have been in outright slavery; and the speaker who mentions them expressly contrasts their position with that of a slave. Here is an early example of the *munera personalia* which in the fourth century were to make life a nightmare for so many inhabitants of the Roman Empire.

The format of the book is good, and typographical errors are very rare. One mistake of fact must be noted: Pompeii was destroyed in A.D. 79—not A.D. 81 (p. 61).

C. E. VAN SICKLE

Ohio Wesleyan University



*Panétius: Sa vie, ses écrits et sa doctrine avec une édition des fragments.* By MODESTUS VAN STRAATEN. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1946. Pp. xvi+399. Dutch Fl. 9.50.

In recent years the books and articles written about Panaetius have reached the proportions of those dedicated to his famous pupil, Posidonius. Dr. van Straaten's work is among the most ambitious of these studies, as it undertakes to present a comprehensive treatment, both philological and philosophical, of Panaetius' life and teaching.

The most attractive feature of the book, to this reviewer at least, is the collection of fragments (pp. 325-78), for a new edition of the fragments was badly needed. They are classified as follows: i, "Détails sur la vie de Panétius" (Frgs. 1-32); ii, "Les Écrits de Panétius" (Frgs. 33-51); iii, "Traits caractéristiques généraux de la doctrine et de l'œuvre de Panétius" (Frgs. 52-63); iv, "Chapitres de la cosmologie de Panétius" (Frgs. 64-78); v, "L'Anthropologie de Panétius" (Frgs. 79-89); vi, "Les Restes de la logique de Panétius" (Frgs. 90-95); vii, "L'Éthique de Panétius" (Frgs. 96-117); viii, "La Doctrine et la philosophie politiques de Panétius" (Frgs. 118-22); ix, "Philologie, histoire et géographie" (Frgs. 123-36); x, "Les Disciples de Panétius" (Frgs. 137-63). An appendix contains two brief fragments (164 and 165) not assignable to any of the ten chapters. Van Straaten lavishly reprints under separate numbers any passages that pertain to more than one of his divisions; for instance, Cicero *De fin.* iv. 9. 23 appears as Fragments 10, 46, 113, 138, and 142. Doubtful fragments are numbered 3a, 4b, 26a, etc.

Most of the fragments come from Cicero, and, of these, the majority are from the *De officiis*. Diogenes Laertius, Plutarch, and Suidas also make numerous contributions, and Van Straaten has included thirteen passages from the *Stoicorum index Herculensis*. Other fragments are drawn from widely scattered sources. Van Straaten has taken the text of the fragments from standard editions (listed on pp. 232-34) of the authors quoted, with almost no changes of his own; and he has included the critical notes of the editors, listing in the back

(pp. 379-89) the various signs and abbreviations which these notes contain. Apart from a few misprints and omissions, therefore, the critical notes are of good quality. It must be remembered, however, that verbs and pronouns in the first person (e.g., *scripsi*, pp. 327 and 330; *malim*, p. 330; *mihī*, p. 347) refer, in the first instance at least, not to Van Straaten but to whatever editor he is using at the time.

Errors and misprints in the text of the fragments are rather numerous but, for the most part, unimportant. I shall mention only a few of the more serious ones. Fragment 28 should have been taken from *IG*, II<sup>2</sup> (1938), rather than from the earlier edition. On page 342, line 9, read *et* for *en*; page 344, line 8, read *ut* for *et*; page 364, line 19, include *ἡδονήν* in the parentheses. In the heading of Fragments 18 and 143 read *Porphyrio* for *Porphyrius*. Critical notes are needed to Fragments 128 and 162. In the lists of signs and abbreviations the signs *W* and *X* used in the notes to Fragment 16 are omitted, and the abbreviation "Babb." used on page 329 is not explained. On page 388 read *Laurentianus* for *Laurianus*.

The considerations that guided Van Straaten in the choice of fragments are set forth in Part II, "Remarques sur la collection de fragments" (pp. 229-321). Here he discusses at length the possible influence of Panaetius on such works as Cicero *De natura deorum* ii; Philo *De aeternitate mundi*; and Plutarch *Περί εὐθυμίας*; and, in general, he finds few passages which can be assigned with confidence to Panaetius beyond those that actually contain his name. Fragment 91 (Sextus *Adv. dogm.* i. 253-57) is the only significant exception.

Part I, "La Vie, les écrits et la doctrine de Panétius de Rhodes" (pp. 3-226), contains Van Straaten's views on Panaetius. It is divided into ten chapters, corresponding to the ten major divisions of the fragments. Van Straaten is extremely cautious throughout, and many of the more hazardous speculations of Tatakis and others are not even mentioned. In general, Van Straaten minimizes the differences between Panaetius and the older Stoics, whenever it is possible to do so. This tendency is particularly evident in chapters v and vii: "Malgré des innovations indéniables dans sa

doctrine Panétius reste Stoïcien de cœur et d'âme" (p. 191).

The volume contains a Bibliography (pp. xi-xv) and four indexes (pp. 390-99).

PHILLIP DE LACY

University of Chicago

*The Journal of Juristic Papyrology*, Vol. I, No.

1. Edited by RAPHAEL TAUBENSCHLAG. New York, 1946. Pp. 155.

Papyrologists in particular, but also students of legal history and all interested in the history of ancient civilization, will welcome the appearance of this new periodical, which is the first in any country to be devoted entirely to the field of juristic papyrology. In this, the initial number, there are four articles—a survey of the pertinent literature that appeared during the war years 1939-45, a survey of papyrus publications for the same period, book reviews, brief notes, and a supplementary bibliography, which contains important additions to the foregoing surveys of literature and editions of papyrus texts.

About half the material in the present number has been contributed by the editor, Dr. Taubenschlag, research professor in ancient civilization at Columbia University and well known for his studies in the law of Greco-Roman Egypt. In addition to the bibliographical surveys, he has contributed a lengthy review of A. Segrè, *An Essay on the Nature of Real Property in the Classical World*; a second, shorter review; and an article on "Customary Law and Custom in the Papyri" (pp. 41-54). In the latter he has presented a very illuminating collection of examples showing the role of custom in private, penal, and administrative law in Egypt under the Ptolemies and Romans. In "Miscellanea papirologica" (pp. 13-40), A. Berger re-examines the controversial Latin papyrus, P Mich. Inv. 4703. He maintains that it is of great significance as presenting a "practical example" of the rarely evidenced Roman practice known as *dotis dictio*. Furthermore, contrary to previous interpreters, he believes that the document is a restitution of dowry accompanying a divorce. In the same article he

shows that the passive form, ἀναλαμβάνεσθαι, in Hadrian's letter (*BGU*, I, 340) has the meaning "to be born, to be procreated." H. J. Wolff in a very thoughtful study of *μισθώσεις* in Ptolemaic and Roman papyri, "Consensual Contracts in the Papyri" (pp. 55-79), concludes that, for the pre-Antonine period at least, the evidence fails to support the dictum of Vinogradoff that in Greek contracts "the obligation in voluntary agreements depends on consent or the mutual concurrence of wills" and not upon the use of special forms.

Professor Taubenschlag and his sponsor, the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America, will have the sincere good wishes of American scholars for the success of this new venture.

A. E. R. BOAK

University of Michigan

*Baalbek [and] Palmyra*. Photographs by [GEORGE] HOYNINGEN-HUENE, with text by DAVID M. ROBINSON. New York: J. J. Augustin, 1946. Pp. 136. \$7.50.

The great ruins of the Near East, while well known to the archeologist and missionary, are still only names to the majority of Americans. This volume of photographs and descriptive text should arouse the interest of potential travelers to the Near East. There are twenty-six photographs of Baalbek and twenty-nine of Palmyra, together with two maps. A selective bibliography is included. The photographs are exceptionally fine and well reproduced. They are noteworthy for their artistry and as archeological records, though they have lost some detail in enlargement. The text by David M. Robinson is both historical and descriptive; but it is unfortunate that it is not more closely related to the photographs, which are really the basic part of the volume. The text, however, is extensive, well written, and arranged to interest the more informed traveler. As a minor correction it should be noted that Crassus was defeated at Carrhae, not at Palmyra.

NEILSON C. DEBEVOISE

Arlington, Virginia

## BOOKS RECEIVED

[Not all works submitted can be reviewed, but those that are sent to the editorial office for notice are regularly listed under "Books Received." Offprints from periodicals and parts of books will not be listed unless they are published (sold) separately. Books submitted are not returnable.]

- Boletín del Instituto Caro y Cuervo*, Vol. II, No. 2 (May–August, 1946). Bogotá, Colombia: Instituto Caro y Cuervo, 1946.
- BOS, ISAAC. *Plutarchus' Leven van Agesilaus: Inleiding—Tekst—Commentaar*. (Dissertation, Amsterdam.) Groningen: J. B. Wolters' Uitgevers-Maatschappij N.V., 1947. Pp. [viii]+xxxii+227.
- BOYCE, ALINE ABACHERLI. *Coins of Tingi with Latin Legends*. ("Numismatic Notes and Monographs," No. 109.) New York: American Numismatic Society, 1947. Pp. iv+27+5 pls.
- BRENNAN, SISTER M. JOSEPHINE. *A Study of the Clausulae in the Sermons of St. Augustine*. ("Catholic University of America Patristic Studies," Vol. LXXVII.) Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1947. Pp. xviii+126.
- VAN DEN BRUWAENE, MARTIN. *La Société et les institutions de l'antiquité classique*, Vol. I: *Le Miracle grec: L'Orient préclassique et la Grèce jusqu'à l'époque de Démosthène*. Bruxelles: L'Édition universelle, S.A., n.d. Pp. 395.
- CASEY, ROBERT P. (ed.). *The Armenian Version of the Pseudo-Athanasian Letter to the Antiochenes and of the Expositio fidei*. ("Studies and Documents," ed. KIRSOPP LAKE et al., Vol. XV.) London: Christophers; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1947. Pp. x+64+ii+78. \$4.00.
- CRUTTWELL, ROBERT W. *Virgil's Mind at Work: An Analysis of the Symbolism of the Aeneid*. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell; New York: Macmillan Co., 1947. Pp. x+182. \$2.50.
- ERNOUT, ALFRED. *Philologica*. ("Études et commentaires.") Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1946. Pp. vi+233. Fr. 600.
- Eumusia: Festgabe für Ernst Howald zum sechzigsten Geburtstag am 20. April 1947*. Erlenbach-Zürich: Eugen Rentsch Verlag, 1947. Pp. 208. Paper, Fr. 13.80.
- FOURNIER, H. *Les Verbes "dire" en grec ancien (exemple de conjugaison supplétive)*. ("Collection linguistique," publiée par la Société de linguistique de Paris, Vol. LI.) Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1946. Pp. xii+234. Fr. 600.
- HANSEN, ESTHER V. *The Attalids of Pergamon*. ("Cornell Studies in Classical Philology," Vol. XXIX.) Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1947. Pp. xxxvi+464. \$4.50.
- Hermathena*, No. LXIX (May, 1947). Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co.; London: Longmans, Green & Co. 3s.
- JENSEN, POUL JOHANNES. *Det latinske Perfektsystem, Studier I: Kategorierne Modus og Tempus i Ciceros Sprog*. With a Summary in English. Copenhagen: Einar Munksgaards Forlag, 1941. Pp. xvi+162.
- LAMBERT, ANDRÉ. *Die indirekte Rede als Künstlerisches Stilmittel des Livius*. Dissertation, Zurich, 1946. Pp. 80.
- LEHMANN, PHYLLIS WILLIAMS. *Statues on Coins of Southern Italy and Sicily in the Classical Period*. New York: H. Bittner & Co., 1946. Pp. x+72. \$3.50.
- LEJEUNE, MICHEL. *Traité de phonétique grecque*. ("Collection de philologie classique," Vol. III.) Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1947. Pp. xvi+358. Fr. 600.
- MARTINAZZOLI, FOLCO. *Ethos ed Eros nella poesia greca*. ("Biblioteca di cultura," No. 27.) Firenze: "La Nuova Italia," n.d. Pp. 503. L. 450.
- NINCK, MARTIN. *Die Entdeckung von Europa durch die Griechen*. Basel: Benno Schwabe & Co., 1945. Pp. 287. \$4.25. Order from Albert J. Phiebig, Suite 1209, 545 Fifth Avenue, New York 17, N.Y.
- PARATORE, ETTORE. *Una nuova ricostruzione del "De poetis" di Suetonio*. Rome: Casa editrice Gismondi, 1946. Pp. 304. L. 550.
- . *Virgilio, Eneide, libro quarto*. ("Convivium: Collana di autori greci e latini," ed. GIOVANNI NENCIONI and ALFREDO RIZZO, Vol. IV.) Rome: Casa editrice Gismondi, 1947. Pp. xlviii+167. L. 280.
- PELLEGRINO, MICHELE. *Studi su l'antica apologetica*. Rome: Edizioni di "Storia e letteratura," 1947. Pp. xii+210.

*Phoibos: Bulletin du Cercle de philologie classique et orientale de l'Université libre de Bruxelles*, Vol. I (1946-47). Pp. 24.

ROBINSON, CHARLES ALEXANDER, JR. *Alexander the Great: The Meeting of East and West in World Government and Brotherhood*. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1947. Pp. 252. \$3.75.

SKARD, SIGMUND. *The Use of Color in Literature: A Survey of Research*. ("Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society," Vol. XC, No. 1.) Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1946. Pp. 163-249. Paper, \$1.25; cloth, \$2.00.

*Universidad de Antioquia*, No. 81 (January-

March, 1947). Medellín, Colombia: Universidad de Antioquia.

WIEGREN, ALLEN. *Hellenistic Greek Texts*. With the collaboration of ERNEST CADMAN COLWELL and RALPH MARCUS. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947. Pp. xxvi+275. \$3.50.

WOLFSON, HARRY AUSTRYN. *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. ("Structure and Growth of Philosophic Systems from Plato to Spinoza," Part II.) 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947. Pp. xvi+462; xiv+531. \$10.00.

## INDEX TO VOLUME XLII

- Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 1323-26, discussed 179;  
*Eumenides* 881-91, discussed 122 f.  
 Announcement 136  
 Apollo, 'Ἀπόλλων Ὀνός 223 f.  
 Aristides, Aelius, and Marcus Aurelius 17 ff.  
 Aristophanes, *Thesmophoriazusae*, parabasis of  
 180 f.  
 Aristotle, on language and the arts of language  
 21 ff.  
 Aurelius, Marcus, and Aelius Aristides 17 ff.  
 Bede, manuscripts of 73 ff.  
 Book Reviews:  
 Bergman (ed. and trans.): *Hrotsvithae liber  
 tertius: A Text with Translation, Introduction,  
 and Commentary* (Gamer) 201  
*Boletín del Instituto Caro y Cuervo*, Vol. I  
 (Treviño) 70  
 Bolling: *The Athetized Lines of the Iliad*  
 (Combella) 183  
 Bonfante: *Los Elementos populares en la  
 lengua de Horacio* (Whatmough) 67  
 Bourne: *The Public Works of the Julio-  
 Claudians and Flavians* (Van Sickle) 261  
 Carpenter: *Folk Tale, Fiction, and Saga in the  
 Homeric Epics* (Smith) 194  
 Chantraine: *Morphologie historique du grec*  
 (Whatmough) 134  
 Courcelle: *Les Lettres grecques en Occident:  
 De Macrobie à Cassiodore* (Laistner) 254  
 Currie: *Essentials of General and Scientific  
 Latin* (Skiles) 70  
 Eranos Löfstedt: *Opuscula philologica  
 Einaro Löfstedt a. d. XVII Kal. Iul. anno  
 MCMXLV dedicata* (Whatmough) 203  
 Fränkel: *Ovid: A Poet between Two Worlds*  
 (Otis) 57  
 Frisch: *Magt og Ret i Oldtiden*, Vol. I: *Fra  
 Homer til Perserkrigene* (Larsen) 205  
 Harding: *Milton and the Renaissance Ovid*  
 (Bush) 132  
 Hoyningen-Huene and Robinson: *Baalbek  
 [and] Palmyra* (Debevoise) 264  
 Hyde: *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman  
 Empire* (Case) 205  
 Jones (trans.): *An Introduction to Divine and  
 Human Readings by Cassiodorus Senator*  
 (Laistner) 254  
*The Journal of Juristic Papyrology*, Vol. I,  
 No. 1 (Boak) 264  
 Kerényi: *Die Geburt der Helena samt humanis-  
 tischen Schriften aus den Jahren 1943-45*  
 (Krappe) 65  
 —: *Prometheus* (Krappe) 65  
 Krarup: *Homer og det homeriske Spørgsmaal*  
 (Larsen) 190  
 Lenzen: *The Figure of Dionysos on the Siphnian  
 Frieze* (Johnson) 206  
 Levy: *Pauli Sententiae: A Palingenesia of the  
 Opening Titles as a Specimen of Research in  
 West Roman Vulgar Law* (Schiller) 260  
 Lietzmann, Bees, and Sotiriou (eds.): *Corpus der  
 griechisch-christlichen Inschriften von Hellas*,  
 Band I, Lieferung 1 (Kent) 63  
 von der Mühl (ed.): *Homeri Odyssea* (Combella)  
 189  
 Muskens: *De vocis ἀναλογίας significatione ac  
 usu apud Aristotelem* (De Lacy) 68  
 Opstelten: *Sophocles en het griekse pessimisme*  
 (Linforth) 125  
 Pestalozzi: *Die Achilleis als Quelle der Ilias*  
 (Combella) 66  
 Philippson: *Thessalische Mythologie* (Johnson)  
 133  
*Phyllobolia für Peter von der Mühl zum 60.  
 Geburtstag* (Krappe) 127  
 Pickard-Cambridge: *The Theatre of Dionysus  
 in Athens* (Allen) 257  
 Robinson: *Excavations at Olynthus, Part XII:  
 Domestic and Public Architecture* (Kent) 199  
 Rozelaar: *Lukrez: Versuch einer Deutung* (De  
 Lacy) 67  
 von Salis: *Antike und Renaissance: Über Nach-  
 leben und Weiterwirken der alten in der  
 neueren Kunst* (Post) 197  
 van Straaten: *Panétius: Sa vie, ses écrits et sa  
 doctrine avec une édition des fragments*  
 (De Lacy) 263  
 Strömberg: *Griechische Wortstudien* (What-  
 mough) 134  
 —: *Studien zur Etymologie und Bildung  
 der griechischen Fischnamen* (Whatmough)  
 134  
 Thiel: *Studies on the History of Roman Sea-  
 Power in Republican Times* (Starr) 259  
 van der Wielen: *De Ideegetallen van Plato*  
 (De Lacy) 204  
 Wilkinson: *Horace and His Lyric Poetry*  
 (Strodach) 63



- Wilson and Forbes (eds. and trans.): *Gabriel Harvey's "Ciceronianus"* (Caplan) 130
- Young (ed.): *Apuleius: Cupid and Psyche* (Durham) 69
- Books received 71, 135, 207, 265,
- calendars, Greek 235 ff.
- Cyrene, dialect of 56
- equality, in Greek philosophy 156 ff.
- Euripides, *Melanippe desmotis*, influence of 180 f.
- Faustina 181
- folklore, Greek 223 f.
- Fortune, the wheel of 251 ff.
- Greece, geography 88 ff.
- Greek drama 1 ff.
- Greek history 88 ff., 235 ff.
- Greek language 106 ff.
- Greek philosophy 156 ff.
- Homer, descriptions of syncopes 106 ff., psilosis in 56
- Horace, and Menander 147 ff.
- Julian, and Libanius 18 ff.
- justice, in Greek philosophy 156 ff.
- Juvenal, *Sat.* 7. 126-28, discussed 123 f.
- language, Aristotle on 21 ff.
- Latin inscriptions 181 f., 249 ff.
- Libanius, and Julian 18 ff.
- manuscripts, Latin, descent of 73 ff., 209 ff.
- Menander, influence on Horace 147 ff.
- Ocisia, story of 253
- paleography, Latin 73 ff., 209 ff.
- Petronius, textual problems 244 ff., 42. 6-7, discussed 182
- Pindar, *Olympian* 9. 82 (76), emendation of 124
- Pyrrhus, apocryphal correspondence of 137 ff.
- Radin, Max, reply to Rafael Taubenschlag 56
- Reviewers:
- Allen, J. T. 257
- Boak, A. E. R. 264
- Bush, D. 132
- Caplan, H. 130
- Case, S. J. 205
- Combella, F. M. 66, 183, 189
- Debevoise, N. C. 264
- De Lacy, P. H. 67, 68, 204, 263
- Durham, D. B. 69
- Gamer, H. M. 201
- Johnson, F. P. 133, 206
- Kent, J. H. 63, 199
- Krappe, A. H. 65, 127
- Laistner, M. L. W. 254
- Larsen, J. A. O. 190, 205
- Linforth, I. M. 125
- Otis, B. 57
- Post, C. R. 197
- Schiller, A. A. 260
- Skiles, J. W. D. 70
- Smith, G. 194
- Starr, C. G., Jr. 259
- Strodach, G. K. 62
- Treviño, S. N. 70
- Van Sickle, C. E. 261
- Whatmough, J. 67, 134 (*bis*), 203
- Roman history 137 ff.
- Seneca, the tragedies, prototypes of 1 ff.
- Sophocles, *Antigone* 904-20, discussed 51 f.
- Taubenschlag, Rafael, reply to Max Radin 52 ff.
- Thrace, *phoros* 88 ff.
- Varro, *Pseudotragediae* 9 ff.

